

THE MONTH

FEBRUARY, 1948

Vol. CLXXXV EIGHTY-FOURTH YEAR

No. 967

CONTENTS

COMMENTS.....	By the Editor	Page 65
"SHADOW OF LIVING LIGHT"	By C. C. Martindale	77
THE RUSSIAN ZONE IN HEIDELBERG	By N. Braybrooke	83
SOUTHWELL AND THE MAR-PRELATES	By C. Devlin	88
THE NOVELTY OF CHRISTIAN POVERTY	By J. Crehan	96
PARTNERSHIP IN INDUSTRY	By Paul Derrick	103
ST. TERESA'S DRUM	By James Brodrick	109
THE WAY OF THE MOON (<i>Verse</i>)	By G. Forbes	128
MISCELLANEA		114
I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES.		
Bring Norway Back.		
A Christmas Echo.		
II. OUR CONTEMPORARIES.		
REVIEWS		120
1.—Nationalism and Internationalism. By Don Luigi Sturzo. 2.—An Introduction to Ancient Philosophy. By A. H. Armstrong. 3.—The Existence of God: A Thomist Essay. By Dom Mark Pontifex, O.S.B. 4.—Cosmos et Gloire. By Albert Frank-Duquesne.		
SHORT NOTICES		87, 95, 102, 108, 127

PUBLISHED BY LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LTD.

6 & 7 Clifford Street, London, W.1

EDITORIAL OFFICES :

114 Mount Street, London, W.1

MANAGER'S ADDRESS :

Manresa Press, Roehampton, S.W.15, to which Annual Subscriptions, 20s, post free (U.S.A. \$4.50), should be sent.

TWO SHILLINGS NET

All rights of translation and reproduction reserved.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

THE MONTH

A Catholic Review, conducted by the Jesuit Fathers, and edited
from : 114 MOUNT STREET, LONDON, W.1.

PUBLISHED BY LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LTD.
6 & 7 Clifford Street, London, W.1

THE MONTH WAS FOUNDED IN 1864, and among its earliest contributors were Cardinal Wiseman and Cardinal Newman, Newman's well-known *Dream of Gerontius* first appeared in its pages. It is now in its 84th year.

IN JANUARY, 1947, IT RESUMED MONTHLY ISSUES, after the restrictions of the war years. There will be

ELEVEN ISSUES EVERY YEAR

The July and August issues appearing together as one holiday number.

THE MONTH provides articles :—

ON SPIRITUAL AND RELIGIOUS SUBJECTS.
CATHOLIC THOUGHT.

MODERN PROBLEMS AND THE
BACKGROUND OF MODERN EVENTS.

Recent Contributors include the following :—

Most Rev. T. Roberts, S.J. (Archbishop of Bombay), Fathers C. C. Martindale, R. H. J. Steuart, James Brodrick, Maurice Bévenot, Bernard Leeming, F. C. Copleston, Leo Hicks and John Murray, S.J.

Also :

Rt. Rev. Mgr. R. A. Knox, Christopher Dawson, Arnold Lunn, A. C. F. Beales and Halliday Sutherland.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION

(From January, 1947) : £1 per annum (*eleven* numbers, post free).

Individual numbers : Two Shillings each (plus postage).

Orders and Subscriptions to : THE MANAGER,
MANRESA PRESS :: ROEHAMPTON :: LONDON, S.W.15

THE MONTH

VOL. CLXXXV

FEBRUARY, 1948

No. 967

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

A Year of Decisions

1948 is to be a year of great decisions. Peace treaties have to be concluded with Germany, plus Austria, and Japan. If it is impossible to conclude them as regular peace treaties, signed by all Powers concerned, then equivalent and reasonably permanent arrangements must be made in their place. Western Europe must be set well on the way to economic recovery and reconstruction. Politically, there must be greater stability in France, and in Italy less unrest.

It is darkest, proverbially, before the dawn, and 1947 was dark. However, there were and are some evident signs of daybreak. The Moscow and London meetings of the Four Foreign Ministers showed that a united peace settlement with Germany was at present out of the question. It also showed—and these were more valuable lessons—that other arrangements have to be made very soon with regard to Germany, and that the peace treaty discussions concerning Japan cannot be left to the Four Foreign Ministers; they must be entrusted to the wider company of the countries that fought against Japan, without the possibility of any one Power frustrating and nullifying all such discussions. The Marshall Plan, with its promise of great material assistance to Western Europe and its insistence upon a programme of self-help within, and mutual help between, European countries, has had already both a steadying and encouraging effect. The failure of the Communist attempts to disrupt France and Italy through a General Strike has given a stronger stability to the French and Italian Governments and awakened a fuller confidence that in those two countries democracy can and will win through. The peoples of Britain and Europe have shed many of their post-war illusions; they now see the problems which till very recently it was the fashion to ignore or to confuse. The ground is at least and at last cleared.

1948 must be a year of great decisions.

Lest We Forget

IN all discussions upon the world situation and particularly the European situation of to-day emphasis is placed, quite naturally, on the economic and political factors. Less notice is taken of

psychological factors and little, if any, of the great moral problem which lies behind it all and is the most fundamental problem of all.

The psychological factors are no doubt losing their hold, but for more than two years they have proved a serious obstacle to European recovery. Under the German occupation, it became a patriotic duty to make things as awkward as possible for the occupation authorities. This took the form of resistance, active and also passive. It was patriotic to work for the invader, when you were compelled to work for him, in a slovenly, lazy and inefficient manner. It was patriotic, on the farmer's part, to conceal his grain and produce, and to pass it, not through the German-controlled channels but privately to other Frenchmen, let us say. The practice of avoiding the ordinary markets and of selling through the black market was at first a patriotic and praiseworthy action. It was, at the same time, financially very profitable, for the farmer avoided price control and regulations. Practices which were established, at least in part, to keep goods out of German hands, were continued for motives of personal advantage and financial gain. A course of action may appear, in wartime, legitimate and indeed laudable; if continued into times of peace, it may become both a public nuisance and a social evil. And, unfortunately, the black market habit has since developed in countries which did not tolerate it during the war and indeed then had very little of it.

One legacy of the war was this dishonesty. A second was that of violence. In resistance campaigns men were taught that it was good and lawful to commit acts of violence, to blow up bridges, roads and railway lines, in order to multiply difficulties for the Germans. These men felt no allegiance to the German authorities nor did they recognize the Quisling governments that, in some cases, the Germans had succeeded in setting up. Their allegiance was to their own country, as they visualized it, and sometimes, with greater or less definiteness, to some government or party abroad. Allegiance, in effect, was largely accorded to a local or party resistance leader. From this confused condition of things have resulted several tendencies which have complicated very seriously the post-war situation. You cannot train men to habits of violence during an enemy occupation and then expect them to forget those lessons, completely and immediately, once the enemy has gone. After every war a country must educate its citizens in the arts and attitudes of peace, and this is especially necessary when men have been fighting an enemy, not openly and above ground, but through underground resistance movements. Once you have acquired a spirit of violence against a government imposed on you by an enemy, that spirit requires to be exorcised ruthlessly before you can settle down to a peaceful national and political existence.

These two psychological factors, inherited from the years of war, and fostering dishonesty and violence, have seriously impeded government

plans and efforts for internal economic recovery and have produced a feeling of disloyalty and irresponsibility towards the government. The legacy of violence has encouraged men, in Italy and France for example, to place party before country and to employ methods of terrorism and intimidation even against the governments themselves. This spirit of violence has naturally been used and encouraged by the Communists for their own purposes. However, the failure of the Communist-inspired strikes in those countries shows that a large proportion of working men have had enough of that spirit, and are unlearning that lesson. These factors must be faced and dealt with if economic stability is to be secured, and if the governments are to have the respect and obedience which are necessary in any democratic country.

The Importance of a Moral Outlook

THE Marshall Plan is praised by those who appreciate it, as indeed it ought very highly to be appreciated, as *the thing* that will save and restore at least Western Europe. Yet, "not by bread alone doth man live." It may seem hard to write these words for a Britain whose people to-day do not have sufficient bread, by which to live, and are compelled by necessity and austerity to live in a way, poorer than it should be, and lower far than their heroic behaviour of the past eight years demands and merits. Yet, the fact remains that we think of recovery to-day far too much in material terms. People consider history, politics, indeed everything in terms of economics. That is the Marxist heresy. Yet, the modern Marxist, as you find him among the leaders of Soviet Russia, does not make this mistake, even on his materialistic plane. He thinks of economics in terms of politics. His attempt to "sovietize" the East-Central countries of Europe, over which he and his like have established their control, is not an economic attempt to better conditions of existence in those countries: it is part of a plan to dominate Europe, politically, and to utilize, if he can, the peoples and resources of those countries for this purpose.

There is something far more fundamental than politics or economy to be considered if we would view a problem fully in its relevance to human nature. "Unless the Lord build the house, they that build it have toiled in vain." In men's consideration of the problems of our days the greatest and most important factor is generally omitted or—what is almost more ominous though less culpable—simply forgotten. When the framework of the United Nations Organization was established, within which the nations were to find peace and fraternity for generations, the name of God was sedulously omitted from any part of the long Charter, which was the blueprint of that framework. U.N.O. is a house built upon a veto, rather than upon an awareness of moral standards. Not that there are no principles enshrined in the United

Nations Charter. There are, but care has been taken to dissociate them, politely and politically, from the one Lord and Sanction of all morality, Almighty God. And, if it be retorted that Soviet Russia would never have tolerated the name of the Almighty in an international document, I would reply that Soviet Russia has prevented you from establishing an effective United Nations Organization by insisting upon a veto, and that what you have done is to abandon the name of God for the Soviet veto. You have made it, politically and internationally, incapable of action, as you have, in the eyes of serious men, reduced its moral status.

Rarely have men appeared so lost, so bewildered, so lacking in true guidance as they are at the present moment. Slogans and ideologies, to right and left of them, volley and thunder. They are cajoled, exhorted, compelled to look in every direction. They are offered this and the other by the many canvassers for their favour, but what is offered is always material—food or security or a Workers' this or that. The "bread and circuses" of the worst times of the Roman Empire are likely to develop into the free canteen and free cinema of the twentieth century. Yet, despite these latest touts and prophets, men feel themselves more insecure than ever. They have lost the habit of putting first things first: that is, of examining in the first place their own position before Almighty God, and discovering both their proper dignity as human beings, creatures of God, and the proper and only satisfying purpose of human existence. They must learn the earliest of all true lessons—to look upwards, away from themselves and from the world that encompasses them, with its often cruel demands and insistent problems, to look upwards and make themselves aware of God, who alone can give significance to their lives and security to heart and mind. And with this recognition of God must come the idea of service—service of God in accordance with His commandments and His moral law, and the honest effort to discover the full truth which God has revealed to mankind.

The first need to-day, throughout the world, is a *religious revival*. I use the expression in a general sense, not meaning the revival of all religious sects. I mean that we need so sorely to-day a growing awareness of God, of His Reality in our lives, of His Presence and Providence in the world, and the sense that nothing will prosper or recover except by policies that are in Conformity with the moral standards which God has given to mankind. I mean that spiritual truth is more vital than anything else, and that "bread and circuses" or their modern equivalent are no substitute for it, though these have been employed to blunt man's need of higher things. I mean that Western European peoples, if they are to be saved, and Europe is to be saved and restored with them, must return to their understanding of Christian truth, as they possessed that understanding for well nigh a thousand years. All the good intentions in the world, all the canned meat of

the United States will not put Europe together again, unless Europe can recover that wherein her unity was first established and first enjoyed. What Europe to-day so much needs—it is, of course, not wholly wanting and strong Christian forces are active all over Europe—is the recovery of what made Europe and what alone can remake Europe—a spiritual conception of man's life and its purpose; a true understanding of Christian liberty and the rights of persons, families, groups and peoples; the recognition that man does not live by bread alone, but is a child of God, with his responsibilities towards God and his other responsibilities, based upon these; and that these notions and these liberties he must gallantly and heroically defend, as his fathers defended them, against whatever powers and opinions would deny or destroy them. I would go further and say that he needs to have this realization amplified and enriched by the full Christian truth brought to earth by Jesus Christ, and handed on throughout the centuries by the assured and Christ-guaranteed authority of the Catholic Church. It was the Catholic Church that first made Europe, and no other power can fully and spiritually make it once again.

The Need of a Positive Faith

HERE another point needs emphasis. In the class of ideas which to-day is part of the struggle for Europe, the Western peoples are generally too *negative* in their attitude. Too often democracy has come to indicate "method" rather than "spirit." Men think too easily of the burdens from which a democratic system has liberated them and too little about the philosophy which should lie behind such a system. When they speak of freedom, it is freedom *from* something they have in mind, not freedom to lead a positive and definite form of life, in which they heartily believe. In other words, democracy is cherished more for its comforts than its responsibilities, which democratic countries are on the whole slow to recognize and accept. We need a much stronger faith in the way of life that has gradually been developed in Western Europe and in the Americas—that way of life which we term generally democratic. For underlying it is a philosophy and a belief. And this philosophy has important Christian elements. It is not elections that make democracy nor a two- or three-party Parliamentary system; still less is it State control in the real or imaginary interest of the community at large. What makes democracy is the conviction that the ordinary citizen, precisely because he is ordinary, is of the highest importance; that he has rights and interests, and that these rights should be respected, and those interests secured; and that the State exists, in the first place, to do this, to allow ordinary men and women to lead their lives in a peaceful, harmonious and responsible manner. The ordinary man does not exist for the State, though undoubtedly he has obligations towards his fellowmen and towards the organized society in which he lives. He has a position,

a value and a dignity, which were not conferred upon him by any group or party or government, but derived from the fact that he is a human person, with a personal destiny which far transcends every social and community responsibility. He has duties to God, his Creator and Overlord, which he should normally fulfil in the humble spirit of prayer, in the steady recognition of God's Providence and Love, and in the effort to lead a moral life in accordance with God's commandments and with the truth revealed by God. He has duties to himself. He must use and develop the talents given to him, employing time to gain eternity, learning to judge of events and situations in the light of the final purpose of his life, as decreed by God. He has duties to his fellow-men, again in the light of that ultimate destiny, a destiny in which those fellow men also share. A true education in democracy is not so much the study of social sciences or social welfare, though that has its own particular and important place, as the study of the philosophy of man. It is this philosophy which, at its deepest level, is the Christian philosophy of man as a creature of God, redeemed by Christ and potentially at least elevated to the lofty supernatural life of grace in association with Christ and the Church of Christ: it is this philosophy that is threatened and impugned to-day by those who profess and propagate the latest tyranny from the East. The struggle is not purely economic, it is not a question whether prosperity will more speedily be achieved under a collective or individualist system of society. Nor is it fundamentally political, to be resolved in the domination of Europe from East or West. In its last resort, it is a struggle for the mind and soul of European man. Is he to remain what centuries of Christianity and also humanism have taught him he really is, a human person with a definite position and worth, and certain fundamental rights and freedoms? Or is all this to be brushed away, as so much ancient and outdated litter that is encumbering the path of modern progress? Europe was made by men who believed—at times it may be crudely—in the personal dignity of man, and gradually developed the social and political consequences of that belief. And from this belief, nurtured and evolving through the centuries of Christendom, has come the civilization of Europe, which is the greatest cultural achievement of mankind. This is what to-day is threatened as scarcely ever before in European history. It has its strong defenders. They would protect it with greater earnestness, were they to make themselves more conscious of the philosophy that lies beneath it and more aware of the long historical experience through which that civilization was developed.

The Concept of Youth

IN other words, there is real need at the present moment of a European consciousness. That the peoples of Europe form one economic whole is reasonably evident. The collapse of Germany and the

artificial division of Europe into two economic blocs have brought grave economic difficulties everywhere. Eastern and Western Europe are largely complementary. That these nations, despite their national and popular differences, form politically a community of peoples, clearly distinct from the peoples of Asia, is also reasonably clear. What is not always remembered is that what constitutes the special characteristic of these peoples is their long experience of a certain outlook and way of life. This way of life has included great variety and diversity, but within a commonly accepted philosophy. Hence the vitality of these peoples, and the richness of their individual contributions to European civilization.

What is wrong to-day, in the very first place, is that Europe is not functioning. It has been the scene of devastating war. This has been followed by a practical partition, the like of which Europe never experienced, even at the hands of the Turks. Our first problem now—first in magnitude, though scarcely likely to be the first to be solved in time—is that of the restoration of Europe. General Marshall, more concerned with the true interests of Europe than many a European, has declared that it is the purpose of American policy to see a community of free peoples restored in Europe. To this end peace treaties must be made as soon as possible, or some alternative arrangements made in their place; European countries must be assisted economically; the artificial division of Europe must come to an end.

In their approach to this problem of Europe the Western Powers are so clearly right as Soviet Russia is so evidently wrong. There is always the danger of painting situations too forcibly in black and white, but in this particular case the picture is white and black. What the Western Powers, and most notably the United States, are trying to do is right. It is right to work for settled conditions, to aid material recovery, to put together what an artificial cleavage has put asunder. And it is wrong, demonstrably and unspeakably wrong, deliberately to prevent such recovery and settlement.

Britain can and should play a significant part in drawing together the European peoples—first, those of West and South—and in providing them with leadership and encouragement. The manner in which the people of Britain, during the past nine months, have set themselves to face and overcome their own acute problems is a good object lesson, and it has not passed unnoticed. Britain had a leading rôle in the conference at Paris of the sixteen countries that desire to benefit from the Marshall Plan. Yet, in Britain there has been much hesitation and delay. Too many people have played too long with the notion that Britain could be a half-way house between the United States and Russia, as they played with the idea that Europe could fall conveniently into two spheres of influence, West and East. More recently, both ministers and pressmen have been outspoken. The failure of the London meeting of the Foreign Ministers and the Russian attempt to synchronise a

General Strike in France and Italy with it, together with the incessant propaganda war waged by Russia against Britain and the United States, have made it perfectly evident from what sources can come recovery and settlement, and what are the forces opposed to it. The January speeches of the Prime Minister and Mr. Herbert Morrison were sound instances of this attitude.

One Passing Illusion

ONE suggestion which is not infrequently heard is that Britain and France, possibly with some other European countries, should form, politically, a Socialist balance between the United States and Russia. The suggestion is based upon a curious fallacy, namely that Europe has any serious desire of Socialism. I am not referring to schemes of public control or social welfare, for these are favoured to-day by every kind of government, call it Left or Right or Centre. The Government of the Argentine, for instance, is criticized most forcibly by the older and conservative parties precisely on account of its far-reaching schemes of social improvement, and yet it is labelled in British papers "Right" or "near-Fascist." Social reform does not mean Socialism.

What must not be ignored in Britain is the resurgence of a "political" Catholicism on the Continent or, if that term be a trifle suspect, of parties, with a definite Christian and Catholic outlook; and these parties are playing a significant part in the reconstruction of their countries. Names like that of MM. Bidault and Schuman come readily to mind, and that of Signor de Gasperi in Italy. In the provinces of Western Germany which must inevitably work more closely together, the influence of the Christian Democratic Union will be very marked. It is important that our ministers and politicians should realise these facts and welcome them in a democratic spirit. They should also understand that the views and policies of these Christian parties are, in many respects, similar to the attitudes and policies of the sounder and more representative members of the British Labour Party.

A Confirmation

THE opinion that Russia is deliberately opposing projects for the settlement of Europe in order that she may herself fish in troubled waters is strongly confirmed by Mr. James F. Byrnes, the predecessor of General Marshall as U.S. Secretary of State. In his book recently published under the title of *Speaking Frankly* he makes it clear that this is the judgment he came to after a series of international conferences with the Russians. The series included the meetings of the "Big Three" at Yalta and Potsdam, and six other inter-Allied congresses.

Of his 562 days in office he spent 350 at such international gatherings. About Germany, he says :

We should recognize that the Soviet Union, alone of all the major Powers, was not eager to obtain an early peace settlement. Particularly in the case of Germany, the Soviet Union was content with any policy that contributed to delay. This permitted them to continue occupying the productive zone assigned to them, to continue drawing off its resources, to continue indoctrinating the population in the Soviet way of life, and suppressing those who maintained other beliefs.

On Austria, Mr. Byrnes's opinion is as follows :

The experience of our representative on the Control Council, General Mark Clark, and my own experience in the Council of Foreign Ministers, force me to the conclusion that the Soviet Union has no intention of concluding a treaty with Austria as long as it can be avoided ; that it desires a prolonged occupation, during which time every attempt will be made to gain control of the economic and political structure of the country and firmly tie it into the Eastern bloc.

Yet, Austria can claim to be the first of the occupied countries, and the Moscow declaration of 1943 had insisted that Austria was to be treated, not as an enemy country but as an occupied area. We have made peace with countries which fought against us, like Roumania and Bulgaria, and liberated occupied lands such as Czechoslovakia. But with Austria there is as yet no peace. This is shameful, and the shame is Soviet Russia's. It was once stated that the three crucial points in Europe are Vienna, Paris and Rome. It is perhaps not without significance that the Russians resist every attempt to get them out of Vienna and that, during the course of the December meeting of the Foreign Ministers, they tried their hardest to instigate a General Strike in those countries of which Rome and Paris are the capitals.

The Brighter Side

THE problems of to-day are so urgent and our present difficulties so evident that we may easily lose sight of the good things accomplished, and the honest efforts made, since the end of the war. Millions of prisoners have been returned to their homes ; for persons who remain " displaced " new homes are being found. A great programme of immediate relief has been carried through in Europe. The speed with which recovery can take place, where there is hard work with concentration on the job in hand, may be seen in Holland and Belgium. Beneath the dark shadows thrown across the Continent one detects an abundance of good work and good will. Nor should one forget the real efforts which are being put forth by serious and responsible men to restore order and promote stability.

It is neither wise nor realistic to be overawed with the threat of Communism in Europe. That such a danger exists is obvious from

the presence on European soil of large Russian forces and the existence of Russian puppet governments in half a dozen European countries. It will remain a danger till those forces and their puppet governments are withdrawn. But this is an overt peril, and the Western Powers are at last keenly alive to it. Meanwhile, of course, underground penetration continues in Western countries. Yet, when one compares the situation to-day with that at the beginning of 1946, it seems obvious that the situation to-day is far better. Then, Communist ministers were in the French and Italian governments; issues were confused; the task of governing was made well nigh impossible. Now, the issues are clear; the Communists are frankly in opposition, sabotaging only from outside, not also from within. They thought in 1946 that no French or Italian Government could function without their support; they have been proved wrong. They thought that no French or Italian government could withstand their opposition. The failure of their General Strike in December, 1947, has here also proved them wrong. France is the test case whether Communism can gain power in a European country not under direct threat from the Russian army. The Communist Party was strong in France before 1939, and it consolidated its position under cover of various resistance movements. Its war-time policy was that of the "Tito" movement in Yugoslavia. It still has the numerous votes of disillusioned and cynical, as well as depressed and distressed, men. The main element in its influence lies in its control of the French Trade Union movement—a control which it maintains, though no longer unchallenged or without a split in the Trade Union movement. Recently, M. Schuman's government has shown that it can overcome the Communist challenge, even through the Trade Unions; and this was done without direct reference to the strong and growing national group of General de Gaulle. At the back of French Communism there exists grave discontent with material conditions and the inequalities of life in post-war France. The benefits that will accrue to France from the Marshall Plan, and the encouragement this should give to Frenchmen to develop their country's life along more normal lines, should lessen very considerably the influence of Russia and the Communist Party in France.

The French are a *logical* people. This is doubtless the reason why, when they move in some direction, they go as far as possible. When they go "Left," they go very far "Left"; they have their *mysticism du gauche*. But there are few peoples with whose character Bolshevism would be more in contradiction. They are intelligent, individualist, by no means easy to regiment or dragoon.

The Question of Spain

IF one desires an example of successful propaganda, there is no better instance than that of Spain. During the civil war General Franco was presented to the British public as a tool of Nazi and

Italian adventurers, and as the enemy of democracy in his own land. Throughout the world war he was again represented as an ally of the Axis Powers. It is conveniently forgotten that Spain was in effect neutral, and that Spanish neutrality was a very real advantage to the Allies. It is also ignored that General Franco resisted many a tempting invitation from Germany and Italy to enter the war on what must have looked, for a long period, the victors' side. Had he done so, the course of the war might have run very differently. The landings in Northern Africa would have encountered far more serious obstacles. This misrepresentation of Spain has been a signal propaganda triumph for the Power which was defeated in the Spanish civil war, namely Russia. It was Lenin's boast that the second land in which his revolution would be established was to be at the other end of the Mediterranean, in Spain.

It is not my purpose to uphold the Spanish Government of to-day, though I think there are many worse governments in Europe. It is possibly a dictatorship, but dictatorship is not confined to Spain. It has ruled the country throughout extremely difficult years, with little help or sympathy from abroad. No one has been able to suggest any practicable alternative. Perhaps it should have evolved in the direction of a more liberal and less authoritarian régime, but this is to judge of Spanish politics through British eyes.

What is monstrous is that Russia and her satellites—with the half-hearted connivance of other Powers—should have pilloried Spain, through the channel of the United Nations Organization, as an obstacle to world peace. There are certainly obstacles to peace in the world, but Spain is not among their number. The unrest in Europe does not proceed from Spain; there are no "Falangist" parties with seats in French, Italian or British Parliaments. The unrest in Europe is largely instigated by the Power which General Franco overcame in Spain. This makes it the more deplorable that one European country alone was deliberately excluded from the Marshall Plan, and that this one country fought a successful fight against the Power which is trying to make that Plan ineffective.

The co-operation of Spain is very necessary, if European economy is to be restored. Its position is of great strategic importance, for it is the bridgehead between the New World and North Africa. The Russians are well aware of this. Lately, Moscow Radio has been attacking Spain as just such a European bridgehead for the "imperialistic designs" of the United States. They see more clearly than many Europeans the significance of an anti-Communist Spain in the struggle for Europe.

The Spanish people are a sound, dignified and proud people, with a long and great historical achievement. They have been offended by misrepresentation, as they have been shocked by what they term the "selective democracy" of Western countries. The discrimination

against the Spanish Government and people has been as harmful to Europe as it has to Spain itself.

Darkness Over the Holy Land

IT is a cruel thought that the Holy City of Jerusalem, hallowed by the memories of the Incarnate Son of God, should now be the scene of bitter strife, and that the Holy Land itself should have witnessed, these past few weeks, so much war and bloodshed. At the time of writing, nearly one thousand lives have been lost since the United Nations' decision to partition Palestine.

The tragedy is deepened by the realization that no other solution is possible. It would be impracticable to suggest that the British Government, which was primarily responsible for the settlement of Jews in Palestine, and the U.S. Government, which is so sensitive to Zionist claims, should undertake the task of re-embarking the Jewish settlers and finding them new homes, or a new home, in the British dominions and in the United States. Yet, short of some radical solution of the kind, the world is likely to be saddled with a continuing war that will flare up from time to time and make peaceful settlement impossible. The British experience in carrying out the Mandate in Palestine has been most painful, despite the restraint of British officers and officials. The British forces in Palestine do not and cannot fully control the situation. If this war between Jews and Arabs continues, either a large police garrison will have to be provided by the United Nations Organization—which in effect will have to protect the Jews and will naturally appear to the Arabs as a new weapon of Jewish exploitation—or some great Power will intervene to do what Britain has been attempting to do for the past twenty-five years. That Power might be the U.S.A., might *have to be* the U.S.A. This would be inadvisable. It might, on the other hand, be Russia : with consequences which would very seriously embarrass the international position.

The difficult situation in Palestine is the result of several factors, most of which could scarcely have been anticipated when Jewish settlement was first encouraged after the war of 1914-1918. In Britain, much of the sympathy with the Jewish victims of Nazi brutality has been offset by Jewish behaviour in Palestine during the past three years. But it is not a question of sympathies or prejudices, one way or the other. A grave danger has to be averted, a problem solved. The United Nations Organization has brought this problem to a head through its decision to divide the Holy Land. It must have its decision accepted. Possibly its best approach would be through new meetings with the heads of Arab States. "Compromise" is not a common Moslem word, but compromise there will have to be.

“SHADOW OF LIVING LIGHT”

TWO MEDIEVAL MYSTICS

THE repeated warnings issued by the Holy See against a ‘false mysticism’ allude rather to doctrinally dangerous theories, connected e.g. with the ‘Mystical Body of Christ’, or the priesthood of the laity, rather than with ‘mystical’ states as such. In England, Catholics are men of ‘common sense’ and apt, perhaps, to concentrate on correct behaviour rather than on unusual spiritual ‘experiences’—no wonder, since their Protestant background relied so much too much on the latter. But there is a new, real interest noticeable among non-Catholic Englishmen in what is vaguely called ‘mysticism’, and since they usually lack any firm intellectual belief, they are easily lost in territories which for them are uncharted (e.g. Mr. Aldous Huxley, trying to cope with St. John of the Cross or even Friar Joseph). Indeed, a positive dislike, more or less latent, of the intellect, and therefore of all dogma—especially Catholic—inclines them to prefer writers at whom Catholics have tended to look somewhat askance. Not only do we wish for a complete examination of the whole ‘flow’ of Catholic mysticism from the outset, but, since this may be too tremendous a task, we would welcome more research on the national scale, e.g. for Italy or Portugal, convinced that it would reveal a profound spiritual life in peoples, and periods, which have been presented to students of history from the political or military angle only, and, as a rule, in a harsh or contemptuous way.¹ Here I want to recall the memory of two German mystics—most certainly not making a serious study of their experiences, but hoping to suggest how subtle was their self-analysis, or at least how heroic was their attempt to arrive at a correct distinction between what, in their experiences, came from God, and what from themselves (even when their own contribution might be ‘abnormal’, such as clairvoyance).

Elizabeth of Schönau was born about 1130 and died 1165. She entered the ‘double-monastery’ of Schönau in Nassau at the age of 12 and in 1157 was made superioress of the nuns under Abbot Hildelin. She was at once popularly described as ‘Saint’ but never officially canonised though her name was put into the Roman Martyrology in 1584. She had many ‘revelations’ which despite intense repugnance she noted down on wax tablets: Hildelin told her to give them to her brother, the priest Eckbert; to these, she added verbal explanations; Eckbert wrote it all out at full length and finally published it under Elizabeth’s name.

¹ Naturally I recall the abbé Bremond’s vast and, to my mind, ill-digested material which, none the less, has revealed to Catholics the totally unsuspected spiritual treasures of sixteenth and seventeenth century France. Surely the same can be done, and better, for other countries too?

We here meet with an initial and recurrent difficulty. 'Revelations' are often taken down by an amanuensis who is himself in difficulties when the 'seer' speaks with extreme rapidity, like St. Mary Magdalen de' Pazzi, or (because of weakness, like Elizabeth) in little gasps or almost inaudibly; or, when a St. Angela of Foligno tries to utter 'ineffable things' and then cries: "It was quite different from that!" when the scribe reads to her what he had accurately written down. I say nothing of deliberate literary 'improvements' or amplifications like those of the poet Brentano who 'took down' the visions of Catherine Emmerich. It is said that one can fairly easily distinguish Eckbert's own style from Elizabeth's, though I am inclined to trust him more than some later critics do, if only because he (like his sister) *wanted* all that she said to be divine in origin, and yet distinguishes clearly between different *sorts* of experience.

Thus Elizabeth was at times, though not often, simply 'clairvoyante'. Sitting in the chapter-house 'from which the sky was not visible', she saw, 'with the mind's eye only', a rainbow. She prayed naïvely 'in her heart': "O Lord, let me see with my eyes also what I now see in my mind". The sisters began coming out of the chapel and stood looking at something. "What", said her companion, "can it be?" "I expect", said Elizabeth, "it is a rainbow which I have seen in my mind". They went out, and there was the rainbow. This experience was not 'religious' or symbolical. Other visions were so, but even while describing them 'pictorially' she is as explicit as St. Teresa that they are seen with the *mind*. Her imagery is derived from the Scriptures (in which of course she was steeped) or the Liturgy or from the art of her time: but at times it is *unfinished*—e.g. she sees the Holy Spirit, naturally, as a Dove, yet 'with a red something' in its beak in which it lets others share, e.g. at Communion: she knows too that the Holy Spirit is not a Dove—it is her mind which supplies that, and adds it to the 'given' vision. Again, she sees Our Lady, and even, her lips moving: but she hears her words only in her soul, just like Bernadette and Lucia. Her imagination was moreover 'free': she would see Our Lord with black hair, and Our Lady dressed in purple, unusual artistic elements. She could distinguish 'natural' joys or depressions from truly spiritual ones. Thus, prevented one Whitsunday from receiving Communion she let herself sink into gloom, hated her prayers, wanted to throw away her psalter after reading one verse, felt she disbelieved the Scriptures and at last was tempted to suicide. She knew from the outset that this was 'no good sadness' just as she knew the psychological origin of some of her illnesses, but perceived the *point at which* spiritual (diabolic) influences too began to turn her condition into a straight temptation. Unable to witness the Holy Week liturgy, she had a long pictorial 'vision' of the Passion—"I did not indeed enter into ecstasy; the whole of my consciousness was there, but I could

not attend to anything else". Often, aware that she was 'verging towards ecstasy', she would struggle against yielding, as St. John of the Cross did by rapping his knuckles on the wall. Nor was her active imagination always trustworthy; e.g. egged on (regrettably) by her superiors, she provided regular biographies for St. Ursula and her 11,000 companions and was thus actually responsible for much of their current 'legend'.

Eckbert's description of her last sickness is full of vivid little details that are, I feel sure, authentic. Thus she complained gently of her martyrdom—she could not lie flat, and because of her cough and sickness could not receive Communion: her Angel consoled her—all her life she had suffered, for her purification, from "a great smallness"; but she should yet be consoled. "A great smallness!" Certainly a woman like her, with wide views and world-embracing desires, could not but suffer from a sense of 'restriction': she had no intense exterior life like St. Hildegard's or St. Catherine of Siena's. She suffered much from being unable to die. "What is going to happen?" she kept saying. Those who were to take her soul from her body kept approaching and then withdrawing again. It was, that she might still 'help others'. And indeed, a procession passed through her cell—to each she gave detailed instruction: e.g. to soldiers, that it was their business to *protect* the people, not to *tear their clothes*, nor hit them, nor loot, nor sin against chastity. She had often prayed that at her funeral no storm might inconvenience people; and indeed, while for three days the whole country-side flocked to see her, and the sisters were actually let out of enclosure to follow her to her grave, "never, during that summer, had the weather been finer!"

Elizabeth's life fell wholly within that of St. Hildegard of Bingen (1098–1179). I must disregard the whole of the exterior life of this amazing woman—her correspondence was enormous; she wrote to most men of mark, including St. Bernard, and to four Popes in succession. Anastasius IV, who was nearly 100, asked her to write to him as she had to his predecessors. She *did*. . . . "Oh man . . . you care nothing for Justice, that king's daughter, heaven-beloved. . . . You leave that princess lying prostrate on the earth, stripped of crown and dress by the brutality of your officers. . ." Bishops and princes visited her; Barbarossa himself sent for her to Ingelheim. It is indeed the psychology of these medieval potentates that deserves study! Incapable of any long and logical argument, these passion-tossed men were overwhelmed by what they regarded as messages from God; were stirred by their very obscurities, shuddered when they were threatened, repented under the shock, and then—not always!—swung back to savage crime when lust or greed attacked them anew.

At home, Hildegard led the demurely gay life proper to happy convents: she wrote little plays; she composed hymn-tunes; she invented a sort of code-talk probably having about as much to do

with any spoken language as our Cockney rhyming-slang used to ; she devised a system by which running water came to all the offices ; she was constantly dictating her 'revelations' to a certain Guibert who was allowed to correct her mistakes in Latin but not to change the sense. Indeed, her huge book *Scivias* (i.e. *Si scires vias Domini*) is so highly 'personal' that I cannot doubt but that it is substantially hers. Feeling herself but 'a cloud driven by the wind', just a 'simple creature', *homo simplex*, one would say that this aged woman—she was 80—prayer herself into an obscure death. All we know is that it took place on Sunday evening, September 17th, 1179.

In studying St. Hildegard, we notice first that she *observed* all that she possibly could. She wrote a great deal on medicine, making all sorts of scientific mistakes, proper to her time, about the nature and properties of plants, but apparently knowing all that was then known, and obtaining her knowledge so far as possible by experiment. She then seeks the *reason* for the powers of plants (or of anything that produces effects) : she powders her pages with : "Why?", "How so?" And her answers imply the belief that the world, as God means it to be, is an 'active harmony' : Sin has disturbed this (whence illnesses, wars, heresies, etc.) : but man can collaborate with God in bringing the dis-harmony back to harmony. So, if a plant heals, it is good not only for the sick man, but *for the plant* to do so, for a thing is improved by fulfilling its function. She sees thus a theological process of slow evolution, in which the human will plays its part. She sees moreover the sun as fixed in the centre of the firmament, controlling the other heavenly bodies, and *fore-sees* what is better than the dissipation of energy, the ultimate repose of all those bodies in an equilibrium such that energy will not be lost, but effort will be unnecessary. Elsewhere she really becomes 'Platonic', as she was, above, 'Aristotelian' : she sees the same harmony, eternal and complete, in the divine Mind : all things that exist, exist primarily there : but also, in the human mind, in a way superior, more spiritual, therefore, to their terrestrial existence : but *also* they exist in a Faith-world, mystically : thus the more 'real' and living 'earth' is the Church, whose mystic trees must be fruitful in good works. The force energising all this starts from their divine Exemplar—she sees a gigantic Man, feet in the abyss, head in the heavens, turning now to East, now to West, uttering a trumpet-cry which contains all sounds. This is Christ, at whose instigation the whole interwoven movement—I had almost said Dance—of human desires takes its origin. *Omnia per Ipsum, ad Ipsum, et in Ipso.*¹

¹ Writing to Mainz, under an interdict so that no music was sung in its churches, she says that man's soul, nay, all creation, is meant to be a harp on which exquisite melodies and harmonies should be played. Sin has broken the instrument ; only a vague consciousness remains in man of the powers dormant within him—like the quick-fading memories of dreams. It is for man to seek to restore his soul, so that God may once more play on it His perfect music.

Her most personal contribution to the matter is this—she held that from childhood a light shone in her soul which was not just that of the mind. By a bold paradox, she called it "Shadow of the Living Light". On to the field which it illuminated, the radiance of the Living Light Itself cast images of things. She insists, of course, that her senses played no part in this vision: she was 'awake', not in ecstasy; she suffered none of the inhibitions which ecstasy so often imposes on parts of the complex human creature. She had never heard of this experience being shared by anyone else. At the risk of vulgarising her sublime metaphor, may I put it thus. To be seen at all, an object needs to be illuminated. It is so, by the light of sun or lamp, etc. To be known, it must be played on by the light of the mind. Above this was a light which compared with the mind's light was indeed an illumination, though compared with God Himself even it was but shadow. In it, she saw things in a way superior to that of the senses or of separate ideas which are indeed drawn from the senses. Can one, without too grave inaccuracy, put it thus—she saw things somewhat as the blessed in heaven see *things*: not with divine knowledge—for the '*seers*' are not God; nor with the beatific vision which contemplates God Himself—for the *things* are not God: but somewhat in the way in which the soul, enjoying the beatific vision of God, turns back and sees created things. If Hildegard was ordered to relate what she had thus seen, she could not but do it by means of symbols—which she knows *are* symbols for she constantly qualifies them by 'as though', 'as it were', which St. John too does in his Apocalypse. These symbols were provided by her habitual very rich imagination—mountains, clouds, eyes, castles, roads, composite figures of all sorts. Then, I think, she will consciously elaborate these symbols till they turn into sheer allegories which she elucidates—at least to her satisfaction! Also, she may 'moralise' what she has seen, and apply it to the lives of bishops, monks, laity, etc. She inserts too every imaginable digression, due, I think, simply to associations between symbols or even words: a 'tower' may make her think of a wall, or a hill: a 'cloud' (to use an English example), may assonantly suggest to her a 'crowd'. Here, then—in her personal contribution—is the opening for many an error or misinterpretation. To us, at first, a page may seem sheer chaos: then, as in *Genesis*, the watery abyss, 'without form and void' though pregnant with *possibilities*, takes form, order and life under the stirring of the Spirit. For even when she knows that she is contributing from her own stock, she would have insisted that the contribution was made under the governing will and illumination of God.¹

¹ Quite possibly my own ignorance of much early medieval 'symbolology' may account for various obscurities. Its symbols are, certainly, responsible for much tragic 'restoration' of ancient buildings. E.g. statues of Our Lady were often placed upon some symbol of hers—e.g. the Burning Bush. Unaware of this, the restorer is quite apt to turn the Bush

Hildegard, then, in common with the best medieval mystics, is an *inclusivist*—she attends to and uses all that 'is' in any way; she does not pursue the 'negative' way of riddance. Indeed, the candour of her examination of facts might well astound our queasier modern mind. The spiritual crown of this era and method seems to me to be St. Gertrude. Hildegard sees 'things' to which reality and truth belong on ever loftier planes. She sees, for example, a tree: then, the tree as known by her: then its allegorical, symbolical, or ethical values (the allegorical meaning of the tree is something as it were parallel to it: the symbolic, something to which it points): then *possibly* she has some confused grasp of the tree's existing in the realm of pure ideas: then she sees its 'mystical' value—i.e. the tree caught up into the supernatural system and grace: and, supremely, the tree as existing in the archetypal Truth of God. This she does not actually 'see'; but she does see the tree in the supernatural world, illuminated by the Shadow of the Living Light—though of course this does not at all mean any mere 'rational' conclusion, e.g. that the tree is meant to help me save my soul. But this ascending scale of existences and truths does not consist of superimposed unconnected layers: it is, or is meant to be, a living active harmony, thrown out of gear, indeed by sin, but in process of a better re-construction by the pervasive energy of Christ. He would, even had sin not entered, have constructed this Universal Communion: Sin has altered His method, not His intention. Herein, perhaps, we may find a clue to Hildegard's labyrinthine mind: such was her mental agility that she would pass in a flash from one sort of truth to another without in the least feeling that she was deserting her subject.¹

We badly need, therefore, a fully scientific edition of the writings of these two Saints, if only to counteract the deterrent supplied by the obscurity of their writings and the complexity of their state of mind, and lest we should remain unheeding of these inestimable treasures of our Catholic heritage, and risk misconstruing and quite undervaluing those allegedly 'Dark Ages' which contained personages of such fascinating psychological worth, and of so high a spiritual value.

C. C. MARTINDALE.

into a cross between a cauliflower and a chrysanthemum. Or she might stand above some prophet. The restorer, seeing a vague human form in the worn-away stone, might have learnt that Our Lady tramples on the serpent, and so, changes poor Isaías into the Devil. As for the Lion in the Garden of Resurrection, he may think it is a dog, or just eliminate it.

¹ There is some 'straight clairvoyance' in her life which is abnormal, but not spiritual. A bizarre instance—When aged 5, out walking with her governess, she said: "How pretty that calf is inside that cow! White—with marks on its forehead and feet, and its back is all coloured." A few days later, the calf was born, and such indeed it was. I find it hard to think that this incident, so placidly recounted, is unauthentic.

THE RUSSIAN ZONE IN HEIDELBERG

EVEN during the hey-day of the Third Reich Heidelberg seems never to have fallen under the shadow of Nazism in the way that other universities, Cologne and Munster, did. It is true that on political grounds certain professors were excluded from its lecture-halls and their place taken by ill-equipped teachers recruited from the local countryside, yet in spite of this the town did not become a stronghold of National Socialism. It remained aloof and passive. The greeting *Heil Hitler* was no more than a formality, just as an atheist will take off his hat when he enters a church. The environs of the University are practically undamaged, and the town itself suffered only the loss of two bridges, one of which is already repaired. Otherwise, outwardly, it is very much the same, still true to Longfellow's description in which he compares it to Granada and considers it 'hardly less beautiful.' The summer school held at Heidelberg University in September, 1947, gave one, as a foreigner, an unique opportunity to see it from inside and to be able to contrast it with the reports of students from the three other zones about their own universities. In this context at first sight Heidelberg does not appear quite so unique : it is still very much an university in the front line.

Three days after this *International Ferienkurs* had opened, with about two hundred students gathered from various parts of Germany and a handful of foreign students—a hundred of these were expected but the dollar crisis reduced the number to about twenty—a message from the American authorities was announced in the Mensa or dining hall. Students from the Russian zone had been invited, and the Russians had not forbidden them to come, but on the other hand they had not issued them with passes. In spite of this many at their own risk had crossed the border. It was now announced that they could not eat with the other students in the Mensa because they had no official status there. The other German students then sent a delegation to the American authorities to say that if their fellow-countrymen could not stay, they also would return to their zones. The Americans compromised ; they said that the students from the Russian zone could stay so long as they did not eat in the Mensa ; they must find their food elsewhere and a blind eye would be turned on their endeavours to do this. Actually many continued to take their meals with the others. The Americans had fallen in with the Russian way of doing things : only instead of what was officially allowed being made difficult or impossible, what was officially forbidden was made possible in practice.

The students, however, seemed to see in all this only another victory for the Kremlin ; though all that really mattered to them was that for another three weeks they would be able to meet their compatriots.

From then on the Americans abandoned any jurisdiction over the study course. They had instigated the idea of the summer school, but apart from giving it their official sanction they had done little else. No billets were arranged for the visitors, and no facilities had been made for the transport of the foreigners. One was present by American invitation, but one's hosts were the Germans. It was they who found the women rooms in the town, and the men beds in their own Collegium Academicum.

The Collegium is a large, bare, typical institutional building, about a hundred years old, with a baroque façade. Originally it had been part of a Jesuit seminary, next part of the university, then a centre of military training, and later again, as it is now, part of the University. Inside there is little comfort : on each floor three wash basins for about sixty students ; the lighting at night frugal in the extreme ; the temperature, by day and night, wintry. The students pool their wood rations so as to keep the library constantly warm and habitable for study during the day. The food too is frugal : tea is non-existent, and breakfast, except for a small beaker of *ersatz* coffee, depends upon how many bread coupons one has left ; lunch and dinner are usually identical, consisting of a bowl of gruel soup, a plate of noodles served with sauerkraut and the occasional variant of a few stewed carrots and peas. Sometimes it is merely two bowls of soup, with one a little thicker than the other. Nearly all the students have subsidiary jobs by which they re-imburse their meagre funds : for the men it is chiefly sub-editorship on daily papers, for the women private lessons in foreign languages. A certain number of both sexes in the evenings have small walking-on parts in various repertory theatres.

It was possible to learn a good deal from them about the present state of Germany and how Germans regard it. It should be said that though the students are a little fearful of becoming involved in politics lest their studies deteriorate, they are much more politically conscious than their English counterparts. They feel that the future of their country rests mainly upon the effort of her people, and that ultimately neither American dollars nor moral encouragement from their neighbours will save her. Initiative must come from within.

One of their chief obsessions is Russia. A student whom I met on my first night in Heidelberg said to me in rather broken English : "I read the *New York Herald Tribune* every day, and the outspoken attacks of some American statesmen against Molotov and Vyshinsky make me fear that any day we may be invaded." This fear, especially in the American zone, is a real one. If they, as seems to be the case with many of them, still look away from the democracies, and distrust their power or will to help them, they look in trepidation to the East, whence they hear daily fresh reports brought back by personal witnesses, of attacks upon democracy as we understand it. It was one of the advantages of this particular Vacation Course that the students who

came from the Russian zone were prepared to talk without much reserve to the other students since they knew that what they said could not be brought up against them when they returned. From a variety of opinions among the Eastern zone students (ranging from a belief that the world would presently be dominated by Communism to a conviction that Russia twenty years hence would withdraw entirely from Europe) certain ideas or beliefs seemed to stand out.

The first of these was that, at the moment Russia is all out to cast Germany in the same mould as hers. Any efforts towards a "capitalist recovery" are to be thwarted; and in this aim particular attention is paid to the universities, especially since, earlier this year, the Socialist Unity Party was consistently defeated at university elections. In future eighty per cent of the students in the Russian zone will be admitted to the universities from the ranks of the *Volksstudenten*, which means that they will not be called upon to pass a matriculation test. It is hoped thus, by a plebeian franchise, to control the voting in future. At Jena a Socialist Unity Party man, Wolff, is head of the Institute for Dialectical Materialism: whilst many of the students are appalled at Wolff's lack of learning, his appointment recalls sadly for them some earlier appointments of a like kind during the 'thirties. At Leipzig there is a Chair of Marxism. The infiltration method is also applied, though often in a more roundabout way, to activities not directly sponsored by universities but which are component parts of university life. Thus the Communists have founded a Philosophical Society which is a subsidiary wing to the *Kulturbund*; among its professors are Deiters, Braune and Vierkandt. The Communist writer, Anna Seghers, together with Jurgen Kucyznski, run a society for the study of Soviet Culture, and on its board are two professors, van Beck from Berlin and Schneider from Jena, who are described as politically neutral. This kind of neutrality is one of the greatest dangers in Germany. An outcome of German political life in the last twenty years has been the frequent assumption of this 'impersonal' attitude to politics by many. They fear to dabble in them lest they be submerged. For an instance, the lectures this year at Heidelberg on Russia by Professor Hans Eckhardt were disappointing precisely in this: that after his survey of Russian history he refused to give his personal verdict or to say what he thought the future outcome of his survey might hold in store.

All the students at Heidelberg loved singing. It was a wonderful experience to see them at parties, with few victuals and little hock on the tables, raising their voices in songs about fencing, the river Neckar and legendary knights!—their long tradition of musical accomplishment bubbling up and finding expression in their full-throated choruses. As one sat with them in a tavern one sometimes felt inclined to say that these people can be drawn to Christ through song, for a song is a summons and one to which they answer boldly. But the singing dies

down, and perplexity reigns again on their faces. With the blackening down of night their fears of Russia return and with it their distrust or lack of confidence in the Allies. This last is due not so much to the allied failure to remedy the break-down of transport or the devaluation of the mark—for which they hold them responsible—as to their inability to see that the democracy which is prescribed to them cannot exist within their military tradition. The two are incompatible, and a solution cannot be reached by implanting what is not native to the soil but only by cultivating a different good that is latent there.

The Germans often tend to regard the Control Commission as a band of puritan Pilgrim Fathers. And one of the great mistakes of allied policy has been that of the collective guilt idea. The notion of using the theory of collective guilt as a means of preparing the way for democracy has failed completely. It is more of a thorn in the flesh than a tonic. And now, before it is too late, some palliative for discouragement and collapse must be found, and found quickly. Already two years have been wasted. Unless a new Reich is founded one thing is certain: that Europe itself will totter. It may take some years, but without a heart a body cannot live. It is possible for Germany to be the heart-land of Europe. Both geographically and spiritually she could be a strong bulwark for Europe against outside aggression. If she remains a vacuum-land she will be again breeding ground of war. That is the true lesson to learn from Germany to-day, and it is one that her students have already learned, almost too well. Accordingly they are anxious for her recovery, anxious that she may as soon as possible play a useful part within the European polity.

Before such a thing can be realized Germany must have the confidence of the other nations; and one can understand, in view of the history of the past hundred years, the hesitancy which prevails over granting such a confidence. At present the long dragged out system of "de-Nazification" is doing more than anything else to make such a condition impossible; indeed it is doing more than anything else to build up an underground Nazi movement ready to show its head at the fitting moment. The Reich must have a central government, at any rate for the Western zones, invested with valid power, but power that can be canalized locally: so that regional administration really mean something, so that the police have authority and are not a standing joke because before they can enforce law and order they have to call upon the military police of the Allies.

So it is the German people, and more particularly the student population which is their most active element, wait for the lead to be given to them to take the initiative.

The German character is much dependent on outward stimulus before there is an inward reaction. At present many of them look to England, believing that if England consents to German self-government, America and France will follow suit. This could lead to a

concert of nations which could stand firm for a genuine and Christian democracy. Religion and culture may survive oppression (there is still much religion in Russia for example), but unless they are allowed to appear in public life their growth remains underground, a matter of roots at the best. Without a free public life the culture of a society ceases to have its due effects; the fine flower of the European tradition is lost, a tradition in which Germany in her time has played an important formative part. She must be allowed to do so again if the term Europe is not to become a name for an agglomeration of puppet governments bowing their heads to the men of the Kremlin.

N. BRAYBROOKE.

SHORT NOTICES

It has been a pleasure to receive a new German translation of the Psalter, prepared by a Redemptorist Father, Dr. Schedl, from the new Latin rendering published by the professors of the Biblical Institute, Rome (*Die Psalmen*, Herder, Vienna, 1946). What the world at large needs most, and not least England, is more of genuine Christianity; and the issue of a work like this by a Catholic firm of long standing is an encouraging sign. The get-up is excellent; indeed, the large blank spaces, while bringing out the psalms effectively, show no trace of paper-restriction. The book offers little beyond the translation itself, which, however, is always most important of all in the task of interpretation. Dr. Schedl accepts the Latin text without question, and thus perhaps saves himself some headaches. In Ps. viii, 6, for example, "less than the angels", instead of "than God" is more likely to be due to Jewish samples than to the inspired writer. In Ps. xviii (xix), 4, the rendering *percipiatur* (rather than *percipitur*) seems to give a sense opposite to that of the original. On the other hand, in Ps. viii, 3, *schlagen* mistranslates the correct Latin *compescas* (to "still" the enemy). The literary style of the translation appears to be good and forceful, though the ultimate judgment upon that must be left to the native German.

The restraint, and something of the wisdom in this work, *Les Neuf Symphonies de Beethoven*, by René Girard, S.J. (Fides, Montreal, 1947. Pp. 175), appear in the author's caution: "Évitons les discussions, les comparaisons, ne faisons qu'écouter." (p. 135). What is left for the critic to do, then? Abbreviating erudition to the barest minimum, Father Girard gives the listener easy access to the music itself, and shows him what to listen *for*. But he is not brow-beaten, not told just what phrases he is expected to like, and to what degree, and what everyone will think if he does not like them. Instead, some two hundred quotations provide the melodic raw materials of the symphonies; a lucid, objective analysis points out, untechnically, what Beethoven does with his material. The few bibliographical hints are pertinent and adapted to the English reader. In a word, here we have, at last, a guide to Beethoven's symphonies that will serve the needs of the apprentice, of the experienced listener, and of the teacher anxious to avoid the usual pitfalls of popularizers.

SOUTHWELL AND THE MAR-PRELATES

THE DATE OF THE "EPISTLE OF COMFORT"

HOW intimately, if at all, was Blessed Robert Southwell in touch with the literary circles of his day in London? And what, if any, was the effect of his writings upon them? Or—to put both questions in one—did he meet and speak with the great Elizabethan writers, his contemporaries, and did he induce a change of mind or heart in any of them?

His friend, Father John Gerard, bears witness to his winning charm as an apostle; and, thanks to Father Thurston's suggestive articles (in *THE MONTH*, 1895) we know something of the effect of his writings on Elizabethan literature in the years that *followed* his captivity and death. But neither of these answers touches the vital point of his literary apostolate as an aid to his priestly work. Was he father-confessor to any of the several poets and patrons of his day who were 'Catholique' at heart?

That is a question of absorbing interest. But it cannot even begin to be answered until we have a much fuller and more strictly *chronological* record of his doings during his years of liberty, 1586 to 1592. So far as I know, none of his biographers has provided this. They have used their information to illustrate his character and conduct, rather than to establish a sequence of events. A great advance towards chronological clarity, however, was made by Professor Janelle in his book "Robert Southwell: the Writer" (1935); where, after careful examination of the evidence both internal and external, he draws up his version of the actual order in which Southwell's works were written in England.

He assigns to 1586 the rough draft of "Mary Magdalen's funerall teares," and to 1587 the "Epistle of Comfort." The "Funerall Teares" is a purely devotional work, based on a theme then popular in Italy, but the first of its kind to appear in England. Father Thurston and Professor Janelle have sketched its remarkable effect upon the period 1590-1600: that strange decade which, like a turbulent channel linking two calmer oceans, runs between Elizabethan literature and Jacobean, between the poetry of Spenser and the poetry of Donne, between the Shakespeare of "Love's Labour Lost" and the Shakespeare of "Macbeth." Upon these stormy and star-crossed straits, in which many theorists have foundered, this article has no intention of embarking; its scope is only a minor chronological point: the fixing of the date of the "Epistle of Comfort" by a reference from Martin Mar-prelate's "Epitome."

Janelle fixed the year as 1587, because, as he discovered from the

earlier editions, Southwell writes, "You have laboured to suppress us this 29 years," not "30 years" as in the later editions. "30 years" is a round number, and might equally stand for 31 or 32; but 29 is pointed and exact. The suppression of Catholics began almost with Elizabeth's accession, the 17th November, 1558. Janelle, accordingly, suggests that "this 29 years" means "in the 29th year of the Queen's reign," as the official documents would describe it. He concludes that the "Epistle" was written "shortly before December 1587." His argument is valid as regards the year, but not as regards the month. "The 29th year of the Queen's reign" might mean any time between the 18th of November, 1586, and the 17th of November, 1587. Southwell was just as likely to have made the number accurate because the year was beginning as because it was ending.

What has this to do with Martin Mar-prelate?

The connection between Mar-prelate and the "Epistle of Comfort" was first conjectured by Father Pollen in the following way.¹ He first quotes Father Gerard's words about the "private house" which Southwell, by the generosity of Anne Countess of Arundel, was able to maintain in London, and where "also, he kept a private printing-press whence issued his incomparable works." Then he alludes to, *but does not cite*, a pamphlet by the pseudonymous puritan "Martin Mar-prelate" in which Archbishop Whitgift is attacked for tolerating a Catholic printing-press under the patronage of the Earl, or Countess, of Arundel, at the Charter-house (i.e. Howard House). Lastly, Father Pollen provides the very important information that Southwell's "Epistle of Comfort," though its title-page says "Imprinted at Paris," must in reality have been secretly published in England, for it is printed "on English pot-paper" (having the Pot as watermark). All three points are evidently connected in Father Pollen's mind, but being intent upon another matter (the martyrdom of Blessed Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel) he has no time to follow them to a conclusion. The connection in his mind between Mar-prelate's accusation and the "Epistle of Comfort" is presumably "the patronage of the Countess of Arundel" to whom Southwell's work is, anonymously, dedicated. But Father Pollen dismisses Mar-prelate's actual words (without quoting them) as confused and inaccurate, on the grounds that Howard House was then in possession of the Crown. Mar-prelate's testimony is only credible, says Father Pollen, as "generally supporting Father Gerard's story" about the private press. Janelle is, no doubt, following Pollen when he says of Southwell's work that "there is reason to believe that the first edition was printed at his own private press at Arundel House in the Strand."²

¹ *Catholic Records*, vol. 21, pp. 319-22.

² *Janelle*, p. 147. Arundel House in the Strand was the Earl's family residence. The Charterhouse, near Aldersgate, also belonged to the Howards; but the Government confiscated most of it in 1585.

But Martin Mar-prelate's testimony cannot be thus lightly dismissed in favour of Father Gerard's. It is, as will be seen from the ensuing quotation, extremely detailed and circumstantial, much more so than Father Gerard's reminiscence, and it refers to a time *before* Gerard had arrived in England. The passage is from Martin's "Epitome" which begins: "Oh read over, D. John Bridges." It was published in 1588, and was addressed to the Dean of Sarum, but was directed against Archbishop Whitgift. Martin is inveighing against the decree of the Star Chamber procured by Whitgift in 1586, by which the Officers of the Stationers Company (printers, publishers and booksellers) were ordered and empowered to break into any printing-house to search for books that had not been licensed by the Archbishop. He contrasts the ruthless action taken against the courageous puritan printer, Waldegrave, in 1588, with the tolerance shown to another printer, John Charlewood, who, he alleges, had been producing a popish book in 1587.

The passage is as follows:—"And, good your grace, I do now remember myself of another printer that had press and letter in a place called the Charter-house in London in *Anno* 1587, near about the time of the Scottish Queen's death.¹ Intelligence was given unto your good grace of the same by some of the Stationers in London. It was made known unto you what work was in hand, what letter the book was on, what volume (viz: in octavo, in half-sheets), what workmen wrought on the same: namely, I.C. the Earl of Arundel's man, and three of his servants with their several names, what liberality was bestowed on those workmen and by whom.

"Your grace gave the Stationers the hearing of this matter, but to this day the parties were never called 'in Coram' for it. But . . . the Stationers had news that it was made known unto the printers what was done unto your grace; and presently, instead of the work which was in hand, there was other appointed, as they say, authorized by your Lordship. I will not say it was your own doing, but, by your leave, thought is free . . ."²

One or two of Martin's blows, in the above passage, are wide; but they do not impair his essential reliability. He was probably not himself a Londoner, hence his vagueness about "a place called the Charter-house." He is no doubt relying on information supplied by someone else, possibly by Robert Waldegrave, the puritan printer at Temple Bar.³ Martin's information can be checked sufficiently to establish at once a *prima facie* case. First of all, Martin does not state, as Pollen interprets him, that there was a *private* press in Howard

¹ Mary Stuart was executed on the 8th February, 1587.

² "Epitome," p. 23, in *A History of Printing*, by Joseph Ames, edited by William Herbert, 1790. Vol. III, pp. 1466-1467.

³ Waldegrave's subsequent career is of interest. He abandoned the Mar-prelates, fled to Scotland, and there, in 1599, published an edition of Southwell's poems, "accommodated to non-Catholic taste"!

House ; he says that a popish book was being printed by a *public* printer able to get his books licensed. Secondly, John Charlewood *did* style himself "printer to the Right Hon. the Earle of Arundell," at least up to 1583 (the year of Blessed Philip's arrest and imprisonment), so presumably he was liable to print for the Countess after that date. Finally, his shop, if not actually "in" the Charterhouse, cannot have been far from it, for it was "in Barbican, at the sign of the Half-Eagle and Key."¹ (Ames. II. p. 1031, 1033.)

Another inaccuracy of Mar-prelate which should not prejudice the issue, is his accusation against Whitgift of showing less hostility to Catholics than to Puritans. Whitgift himself probably knew nothing of the matter ; it would have been in the Bishop of London's jurisdiction ; and he in turn would have had some deputy-censor in the Stationers Company who attended to these charges. Nor is it necessary to suppose that Charlewood himself was a Catholic ; indeed, considering the conditions imposed on licensed publishers, it would be almost impossible for them to be practising Catholics ; if they accepted Catholic books, it would simply have been as a paying business proposition. There may, however, have been Catholic sympathizers among the Officers of the Company. One of the Wardens was Gabriel Cawood (son of Queen Mary's printer) who had the copyright of Southwell's works during his lifetime. Among the lesser-known printers there were also several Catholics, such as John Danter and Valentine Simmes, a future printer of Southwell's works. Another future printer of Southwell was James Roberts, who at this time (1586-7) was assistant-printer to Charlewood ; after Charlewood's death in 1593, Roberts inherited his copyrights. This is a digression, but it confirms Mar-prelate's accusations to this extent : that there may have been elements in the Stationers Company favourable, if not to Catholics in general, at least to Southwell in particular, on account of his sales-value.²

But since the only object in testing Mar-prelate's accuracy is to see whether or no it points to Southwell's "Epistle of Comfort," it will be well here to list the connections so far established. First and foremost, the book indicted by Mar-prelate was printed for the Earl of Arundel ; and it is generally agreed that the "Epistle of Comfort" was written primarily for the Earl and Countess of Arundel. Secondly, Roberts, one of Charlewood's assistant printers accused by Mar-prelate, was subsequently employed by Gabriel Cawood as printer of Southwell's works. Thirdly—a minor point—Mar-prelate says that the popish book was in octavo ; the edition in question of the "Epistle of

¹ "In Barbican" presumably means the street which, in Norden's Map of 1592, joins the Barbican to the Charterhouse. Only a few of Charlewood's books bear this address. One is marked "From Howard House," but since the author is Lord Henry Howard, this probably refers to the place of writing, not of printing.

² Wolf, the Stationers Beadle, and Cawood seem to have raced each other to publish the first editions of Southwell's Poems after his death in 1595. Cf. Macdonald, *Bibliography of Robert Southwell*, p. 75.

Comfort" is in octavo. Its title-page runs as follows :—"AN EPISTLE OF COMFORT—to the reverend priests, and the honourable, worshipful, and other of the Laye sort, restrayned in durance for the Catholicke Fayth. . . . IMPRINTED AT PARIS." Octavo. No name or date. The introduction to the reader begins : "Having written this Epistle of Comfort to an especiaall frende of myne . . ."

But there are three other accusations in the Mar-prelate passage which must be investigated : to test their accuracy, and also to see if they point to Southwell's "Epistle of Comfort." First : in February, 1587, half-hearted measures were taken against Charlewood. Second : some ecclesiastical authority interfered on his behalf and warned him beforehand. Third : to save appearances another book was substituted for the popish one, and entered on the Register as "licensed."

The first accusation receives support from the entries in the Stationers Register grouped under the name of Charlewood (Ames II. p. 1033). From February, 1587, till the end of that year he publishes no books ; the five he had in hand are printed by him for other publishers. At this time printing and publishing were tending to be separate functions—the publisher being the employer who has the copyright and gets all the profits. As this year is quite exceptional in Charlewood's record since 1580 and after 1588, it looks as if some penalty had been imposed on him such as a year's suspension of licence to publish.

To test the second accusation demands a detour, but it leads on to the third point—the substituted book—which is the vital one in connection with Southwell. Who acted as censor for the Bishop of London in the City, and why was he reluctant to adopt extreme measures against Charlewood ? The answer can only be a guess, but there is one guess which seems to hit the mark with distinct probability. In 1586–7 the Vicar of St. Giles, Cripplegate, was the ex-printer, preacher, writer and divine, Robert Crowley, a veteran Edwardian war-horse who had had a stormy past but was at that time in high favour with the Bishop of London, having received an extra benefice from him and been appointed to visit and harangue Catholic prisoners in the Marshalsea and elsewhere. Also—and this is the important point—he was an honorary freeman of the Stationers Company ; he acted as Warden ; and he is found censoring and licensing copies in the City on his own authority. But the Stationers Register provides even more interesting evidence. Of the several books which Crowley wrote after 1580 the printer and publisher was none other than John Charlewood. The last book that Charlewood published in 1586—before his suspension (if he *was* suspended)—was by Robert Crowley ; and the second book he published in 1588, *after* his suspension, was also by Robert Crowley. It needs no very romantic imagination to suspect here the motive which would explain the comparative leniency shown to Charlewood, so completing Mar-prelate's case for the prosecution.

For Mar-prelate's third accusation was that, with ecclesiastical authority, a *licensed* book was substituted for the popish one ; and the only *licensed* book published by Charlewood between December, 1586 and February, 1587, is the Quarto titled as follows :

A Replication to that lewd aunswere which Frier John Francis (of the minimies order in Nigeon near Paris) hath made to a letter that his mother caused to bee sent to him out of England. By Rob. Crowley. *Licensed*.

The coincidence leaps to the eye. Southwell's book is an "Epistle . . . written to an especial frende of myne" in England, and "*Imprinted at Paris*." Crowley's book is a *reply* to a letter written by a Friar in Paris to his mother in England. This, if anything, must be the substitution which occasioned Martin Mar-prelate's caustic comment : "It was made known unto the printers . . . and presently instead of the work which was in hand, there was other appointed, as they say, authorized by your Lordship. I will not say it was your own doing, but, by your leave, thought is free." For Martin's informant had no doubt that the real book was printed by Charlewood in England and on English paper : on half-sheets and in octavo, as Southwell's "Epistle" is ; whereas Crowley's "Replication" is in quarto.

A light penalty was imposed on Charlewood for having a foreign book without leave ; but perhaps his more serious worry was the prospect of having to print an endless series of Crowley's lucubrations. When he resumes publishing in 1588 the next-but-one entry is another "Replication" by Rob. Crowley, made this time to another lewd popish work written in 1575 (!). Its title contains among other clauses the curious thesis "that the religious popish protestants are in deed the right Catholiques." In 1588 the puritan attack on the bishops was in full swing ; and evidently Crowley has come down on the side of the bishops ; after all, there were those benefices to consider. But neither he nor Charlewood need have bothered ; for in that same year Crowley closed his meritorious career and was buried in the Church of St. Giles "of which he wrote himself vicar." Imagination can invent stories to fit facts, but, imagination apart, there is sufficient coincidence in the facts themselves to suggest that the Letter of Friar John Francis, living at Paris, was either the same, or was made to pass for the same, as the anonymous "Epistle of Comfort . . . Imprinted at Paris," which was in reality the work of Southwell.

On the whole, then, the Stationer's Register seems to confirm Martin Mar-prelate's information as accurate and reliable. If it is accepted as such, then either Charlewood or his associate Roberts was printing a Catholic book in early February, 1587 ; and the balance of probability inclines to that book being Blessed Robert Southwell's anonymous "Epistle of Comfort." The conclusion would be that it was written much earlier than has hitherto been suspected, earlier even that Professor Janelle's estimate, which was "shortly before

December, 1587"; it would have been written at the latest in December, 1586, or in January, 1587.

Eleven months earlier, 'Nascitur mus,' one might say: what difference does it make? It makes this difference; that a strictly chronological record of Southwell's apostolate is now pushed forward for another month or two. So far, from spies' reports among the State Papers, from Weston's "Narrative," from Anthony Tyrell's "Confessions," from the "Life" of the Countess of Arundel, it is possible to trace Southwell's hazardous movements and activities and many of his contacts, almost *week by week*, from the day he landed in England, July 17th, 1586, in the midst of the Babington Plot intrigue, till December of that year, when he found some security in Arundel House in the Strand. So we should now know that if Martin Mar-prelate is correct Southwell, as soon as he was free from imminent arrest, stepped at once into the arena and, risking his life again, began his literary apostolate; and all the interior evidence of the "Epistle of Comfort" can then be brought to bear on this date, the turn of the year 1586-7.

But apart from this, wider vistas are opened up. Light is thrown on Southwell's early relations with the Stationers Company. Above all, the contrast is heightened between the sweet nobility of the "Epistle" and the acrimonious, blustering, often obscene pamphlets which were beginning to pour out of Waldegrave's press. The "Epistle of Comfort" was something new of its kind in religious pleadings, both Catholic and Protestant; there is indignation in it, but no bitterness; conciliation but no flattery. It is a plea for toleration, a pledge of loyalty, an appeal to all that is best in human nature and in the traditional English nature. Stilted elegance is swayed by boyish simplicity into the expression of a pure moral passion. At that time, Hooker had not published a line; there was no half-way house for the starved soul between Calvinism and the Catholic Church. If copies of the "Epistle" got abroad (as they probably did) many who read it must have felt once more, as in the days of Campion, "This is the only religion fit for a gentleman." And *that* argument, however much we may deprecate it to-day, was a very potent argument for a generation to whom the ideal of a gentleman was the only ideal that remained.

We know, almost for a certainty, that Southwell's writings, during his lifetime, played a part in the conversion of Thomas Lodge, "that humane and graceful ornament of the Elizabethan age" (c.f. 'Recusant Poets' p. 229). And that knowledge, limited as it is, encourages speculation on other poets and patrons of Lodge's acquaintance.

Yielding to fantasy, and drawing a very long bow, one might speculate on Edmund Spenser, working at that moment "to fashion a gentleman or noble person in vertuous and gentle discipline." We know the extremely depressing effect which the Mar-prelate controversy exercised upon Spenser; we know how increasingly, after 1590, he

began to sicken of his illusory faery court, and to sigh for the old days of Catholic chivalry. I have seen it suggested in an eighteenth-century history of English poetry that the "R.S." who contributed some graceful dedicatory verses to the first edition of the "*Faerie Queene*" was Robert Southwell. Sir Sidney Lee considered the suggestion "improbable," and it is indeed more likely that the initials stand for Richard Stapleton or Richard Stannihurst (both, I believe, Catholics).

But if Spenser is a false trail, there are others. There is one greater than Spenser, who can yield clues that are by no means valueless. But that opens up a horizon far beyond the aim of this article: which has been only to forge one more link in a strictly chronological record of Blessed Robert Southwell's literary apostolate.

CHRISTOPHER DEVLIN

SHORT NOTICES

Mr. Brunini has identified an urgent need which all who have tried to explain the faith to non-Catholics must often have felt. What is desired is that we should have between two covers "the facts of what the Catholic Church is, how she is rooted, what she teaches and why". **Whereon to Stand**, by John Gilland Brunini (Burns Oates, 15s.) is an attempt in 300 odd pages to expound those facts to the non-Catholic enquirer. The author insists that his aim was to produce a large-scale map with all the features of the countryside traced. Certainly his range is wide. He begins with a discussion of the preambles to faith and the book concludes with a description of the ideals of the Catholic priesthood and religious orders. If the volume proves to be less well adapted to English than to American needs the fault perhaps lies in the fact that the workaday vocabulary of theological terms among English Catholics is smaller than that of their American brethren. And so much more will have to be explained to the English non-Catholic enquirer. Is it, for instance, wise, writing for non-Catholic enquirers, to speak without careful qualification of Our Lady as "carrying out her rôle as Co-Redemptrix . . ." (page 253)? A certain lack of finesse will impair the value of this work in the eyes of some readers.

A slim volume of poetry entitled **Wind on Charnwood** reveals itself, surprisingly perhaps to some, as the work of a Cistercian monk. (Obtainable from the author, the Rev. Bruno Walker, O.C.R., Mount St. Bernard's Abbey, Coalville, near Leicester. Pp. 40. Price 5s.) The greater part of the book is taken up with two long poems of a meditative kind evoking thought and prayer, intellectual rather than imaginative, achieving their effect through symbols rather than by images, a kind of psalmody in an apocalyptic key. The remaining poems are mostly sonnets, austere but vital, revealing a distinct power of phrase. Of quite a different kind is the poem 'Air-Compressor', almost a literary *tour-de-force* and showing the author's ability in a less tractable medium.

THE NOVELTY OF CHRISTIAN POVERTY

MEN expect the Church to be poor, for they will complain at what they think to be extravagance of wealth and display in her worship ; but they seldom think why they themselves have come to regard poverty as a virtue. There is a certain grace and neatness in the economy which produces the maximum result with the minimum of outlay, and a mathematician will insist that such graces lend a true beauty to his calculations ; but it is not esthetic considerations which have brought into esteem the practice of poverty as a part of Christian perfection. Others have thought that Christianity is an unstable mixture of Greek and Hebrew ideas : the Greek longing for a blessed mystical vision outside the passage of events, and the Jew for his earthly paradise to be realized in this life ; and they have claimed that the future holds in store a disruption of these elements, whereby the Greek-minded contemplative will be left face to face with the fanatical seeker of some Marxian millennium, and Christianity will be at an end. If such views can be held in all seriousness, then it may be profitable to examine in what sense Christian teaching on the use of the world's goods was novel, and how in this too, as well as in the matter of human dignity and man's relationship to God, Christ came to make all things new. The early Christians habitually thought of themselves as a third race, neither Greek nor Jew, and their enemies replied by accusing them of hatred of the human race. One may wonder then whether there was any novelty in Christian poverty.

It was long the fashion to interpret Christianity, to its favour or destruction, in terms of Greco-Roman civilization. This was largely due to the fact that the critics had to go to work with the only tools that they possessed, those forged in the course of a classical education. The Reformers had little Hebrew learning ; the rationalists of last century proceeded to dismember Isaias because Wolf had done the same, or thought he had, to Homer ; the rejection of the more important epistles of St. Paul followed the same lines of argument as the rejection of the more truly Platonic of the dialogues. For a thirty-year space, now, this fashion has been losing its devotees and no longer has the same measure of support from classical scholarship where Homer has come into his own again.

It is the Jewish antecedents of Christianity which excite most attention to-day. The Christians of Jerusalem did not come to a definite breach with the religion of old Jewry until about A.D. 60, and in those first thirty years of waking life the Church received and incorporated much from the Synagogue ; the very mingling of water

with the wine of the chalice by the priest at Mass as by Christ before him, has a Jewish origin. Such then is the prevailing fashion ; to see Hebrew survivals in the essential features of Christianity, and to discount the Hellenism as a veneer.

It may be unsafe to prophesy the insurgence of a new method of interpretation, but it is worthy of remark that it is still logically and historically possible to find room for a third way : that of interpreting early Christian teaching and practice as derived to a great extent from the Hellenist-Jew mind. Undoubtedly there was then a large and flourishing body of liberal Jews who had adopted Hellenic culture and philosophy as something better than their own ; who held to the Law of Moses, but scorned the secondary traditions of the pharisees ; who supported the Herods in politics even while disliking their morals ; and who provided the Church with the seven deacons. The names of these deacons tell their own tale : Stephen, Philip, Prochoros, Nicanor, Timon, Parmenas, and Nicholas, men from the synagogues of the Freedmen, the Cyreneans, the Alexandrians, and those of Cilicia and Asia. The literature left by these Hellenists is, apart from Philo, not large ; and it has even been suggested that it was deliberately destroyed by the more orthodox Jews when, in later times, they brought such Hellenism under the ban ; or by Christians who had no interest in, and some fear of, such works.

Novelty in Christ's teaching will have to appear by way of contrast with the outlook of each of these three groups, Greek, Jew, and Hellenist-Jew. First one may consider the Greeks. Clement of Alexandria, in his tractate on *The Rich man's way to Heaven*,¹ points out that " it is no new thing to renounce wealth and give it freely to the poor, or to one's fatherland, which many have done before the Saviour's coming, some to obtain leisure for philosophy and carrion wisdom, and some as a boast of vainglory : such men as Anaxagoras, Democritus, and Crates," and he proceeds to find the novelty of Christ's teaching in the spiritual renunciation of the passions, which was, according to him, the meaning of : ' Go, sell what thou hast and give it to the poor.' Mere lands and money are things indifferent ; it is an excess of pride, of avarice, or of other passions which require external goods as their instruments, that brings a man to damnation ; and if he gets rid of this excess he will use external goods with moderation and be saved. This is poverty of spirit, but it is true that Christ blessed actual poverty as well. ' Blessed are ye poor,' runs St. Luke's phrase, and the limiting words ' in spirit ' are not there read.

Clement has, however, made a good point against the Greek ideal of renunciation, such as it was. He is a little harsh towards Anaxagoras ; after all, travelling was expensive in the fifth century B.C. : when travelling by sea one had to own the ship and load it with merchandise in order to have the means of paying one's way in the remoter corners

¹ Clement ; *Quis dives salvetur* ? 11-12.

of the Mediterranean ; and no one could become learned without looking poverty in the face. But the other Greeks who despised riches, the Cynic philosophers and their Roman disciples, were really feeding fat their inborn pride by a show of independence.

There was never a Cynic school of philosophy, as one speaks of the Academy or Lyceum : the Cynics were just a sequence of individuals who tried to be as ' hard-boiled ' as possible. They had less care for philosophic doctrines than the ' Cambridge logician ' of to-day. (In some ways they resemble these new logicians. One of them said : " There is no sense in saying : Man is good. Man is man, and good is good. Propositions are only tautologies.") They respected no one, and on principle said anything to anybody. They would have no ties to wife or country, no art to enjoy, no immortality to hope for ; their writings would be bitter-sweet (*σπουδαιογέλοια*), and their glory was to be apathetic and invulnerable.¹

It needs no comment to show that this was not the Christian ideal of renunciation and poverty. " Tell us, Antisthenes," says Socrates in a conversation with the first Cynic, " why, when you have but a small pittance, you make such a boast about it ? " The answer given is that other men, even the wealthiest, make themselves miserable trying to get more money ! Antisthenes, with enough to eat and drink, a bed to lie upon, and a roof over it, can scorn them all as fools.—But, the Son of Man hath not where to lay His head. (It is worth noting that Cynics were numerous among the de-nationalized Syrian Greeks. Menippus, in the third century B.C., was a Syrian, as also was Oinomaus of Gadara ; and of the two Gadarene swine in the Greek anthology, one, Meleager, was a Cynic.) For the rest, the attitude of the common man, in later classical times, to all these things might not inadequately be summed up in the couplet that was written by the hand of an unknown on the wall of a house at Pompeii :

Balnea uina uenus corrumpunt corpora nostra
sed uitam faciunt balnea uina uenus.²

The Jewish character was not well-adapted to a doctrine of renunciation. " Semites," writes Lawrence, " had no half-tones in their register of vision. They were a people of primary colours, or rather of black and white . . . black and white not merely in clarity but in apposition. Their thoughts were at ease only in extremes. . . . They knew only truth and untruth, belief and unbelief, without our hesitating retinue of finer shades."³ A people of this stamp was not to be contented by dim hopes of far-off bliss. They wanted a full-blooded Paradise, something which had length and breadth and depth, and could be weighed and measured : milk and honey, gold and cedar-wood, and the water of life. If even after the fall of Jerusalem they

¹ Ath. 159 c ; 220 d. Xen. Symp. 4, 34-38.

² First published in Not. d. Scavi, 1934.

³ *Seven Pillars of Wisdom*, p. 38.

clung to their vision, how strongly must it have been held before? In the Apocalypse of Baruch, which was written between A.D. 70 and 100, the earthly Paradise is thus foreshown ;

It shall come to pass. . . .

That joy shall be revealed, And rest appear ;

And then healing shall descend in dew,

And disease shall withdraw. . . .

And no one shall again die untimely. . . .

And wild beasts shall come from the forest and minister to men

And asps and dragons shall come forth from their holes

to submit themselves to a little child,

And women shall no longer then have pain when they bear . . .

And it shall come to pass in those days that the reapers

shall not grow weary

Nor those that build be toil-worn ;

For the works shall of themselves speedily advance

With those who do them in much tranquillity.¹

There are the workers' sanatoria of to-day, the maternity-clinics, the armies of tractors and mechanized harvesters—so that ' the reapers shall not grow weary ' : the outlook is authentically Jewish, but one might almost imagine the vision to be a forecast of that pre-eminently Jewish creation the Soviet-state.

We know what Christ said to all this : first, ' Thou fool ' to the man whom a mirage of bigger and better barns led astray (but not ' Thou thief ! ' or ' Thou Sybarite ! ') ; then His insistence on the primacy of soul over body, of the value of the person over all economic laws, by the injunction not to worry over food and raiment ; finally the call to renounce riches in their entirety for the sake of perfection. This was the most staggering counsel of all. To devout Jews, even to the Apostles, the rich man was the nearest to God among his fellows. If *he* could not be saved except through the needle's eye, how could anyone be saved ? It was an *a fortiori* argument. " Who *then* can be saved ? " : if the rich man cannot, no one can.

It is easy to understand that the teaching of Our Lord on poverty ran clean counter to the ideas of the Sadducee aristocracy, whose hopes ended with this world. But were not the Pharisees free from these grosser expectations ; may not they have anticipated the ideals of Christ ? Now the Pharisees were as bourgeois as their opponents were aristocratic in outlook.² Their ideals were freedom from Rome, a limited charity and much social service. They viewed poverty as a curse ! " May sleep be snatched from his eyelids and his house become void of substance " says one of their documents fervently.³ Their love for the first places in the synagogues, which were their own creation, is no sign of esteem for poverty. They are obviously very

¹ Trans. by R. H. Charles ; ch. lxxiii.

² Ios. Ant. Iud. xviii, 12 ; BJ ii, 162.

³ Ps. Sal 4, 15-20.

much provoked by the mere existence of the 'publicani' or tax farmers (many of them Jewish, perhaps) who ought for their misdeeds to be living on the offal in the streets and quite as obviously were not. They were liberal, in the nineteenth century sense of that word, believing knowledge to be virtue, and opposing the Mosaic conservatism of the aristocracy. But if virtue is knowledge, and money can buy knowledge, there is an end of the simplicity of life, and of the moderation of desires, and one must accumulate. Somehow the Pharisee ideal seems to be portrayed by those silver coins that were one of the first products of the revolt at Jerusalem in A.D. 66. The vine-leaf on the coin recalls the vineyard around which the Lord had built a wall, and the legend is 'Jerusalem the holy': but all this is wrought upon an instrument of trade and barter.

It is true that a Pharisaic source of the time praises the man: "of whom God is mindful in his just moderation. For if a man overabound, he falleth into sin. Sufficient is moderation with justice."¹ But this can hardly be distinguished from the Greek ideal of moderation, and of the need to avoid falling from satiety through insolence to infatuation, after the manner of the tragic personage.

By this detection of a Greek element in Hebrew thought the way is prepared for an attempt to estimate the possibility of the third of the great systems of ideas—the Hellenist-Jewish—having contributed to Christian teaching. Recently² there has been an attempt to call in question the generally received view that the Hellenists of Acts vi. were Greek-speaking Jews; but the philological arguments there urged, and the appeals to our lack of information on their activities, are of little value in comparison with the two facts that Stephen, before the Sanhedrin, speaks of himself as a Jew, and at the same time is quoting from the Septuagint. It may be taken then that the received view about these Hellenists is still in possession. Galilee was only imperfectly a Jewish land, having been in the days of Judas Maccabeus a Gentile land. It was after that time that Jewish colonies were planted here and there within it. Strabo the geographer, an older contemporary of Our Lord, says that its inhabitants were of mixed race, and he mentions Egyptians, Arabs and Phoenicians as being parts of that mixture. Lawrence has some profitable musings on this topic. "Galilee was Syria's non-Semitic province, contact with which was almost uncleanness for the perfect Jew. Like Whitechapel to London, it lay alien to Jerusalem. Christ by choice passed much of the time of His ministry in its intellectual freedom: not among the mud-huts of a Syrian village, but in polished streets among fora and pillared houses and rococo baths, products of an intense if very exotic provincial and corrupt Greek civilization."³ Tiberias was like that,

¹ Ps. Sal. 5, 16.

² *Beginnings of Christianity*, by Foakes Jackson & K. Lake, vol. v, pp. 59-74.

³ *Seven Pillars*, p. 356.

and Caesarea Philippi, Bethsaida and the cities of the Decapolis, but not Nazareth and Cana. The names of the Apostles show something of the mixture of races too; Philip and Andrew are Greek-named, and Bartimaeus (though in Judaea) seems to be hybrid; while for Peter, "doth not his speech betray him" to be from the provinces and not of the metropolis? Such were Christ's own Galileans, and their distance from the Hellenists who read Philo and frequented the synagogues of the Alexandrians in Jerusalem was not so great as it was from the Pharisees. One would expect Christianity, after Pentecost, to spread quickly among such Hellenized Jews, and so it did. But in this matter of poverty, there were no points of contact between Philo and Christ. Philo may have been a Neoplatonist before his time, but if so he was not, for all that, a Christian unawares. For he held that man had no personal immortality to come, and therefore quite consequently that the renunciation of wealth was either due to pride—as in the Cynics—or else was inhuman. Even the contemplative was called to stay in the world of ordinary men. If one had to hazard a guess, it would be safe to say that Philo, had he known Christianity, would have opposed it as relentlessly as did the Neoplatonists—Plotinus, Porphyry and the rest—in their time, for its 'odium generis humani.'

Therefore when Joseph Barnabas the Cyprian Levite sold his estate and brought the money and laid it at the feet of the Apostles, and when not even one of the Christians used to say that anything of his property was his own, and when as many as were owners of lands or houses used to sell them and bring the price of what was sold and lay it at the feet of the Apostles (so that distribution was made to each according as any had need), then was a new thing come upon the earth.

It was not Communism (for after the sale of his property Ananias still had the money at his disposal); it was organized charity, but not for the motive of display. Every small town of the Hellenized East proclaimed its benefactors in three-inch letters of bronze or stone, and the circumstances of the time, when *political* power belonged to the foreigner, meant that *social* prestige was the only possible aim of the ambitious. But here there was no advertisement for the benefactor. Barnabas occupies his niche in the Acts only as an artistic foil to the reprobate Ananias, and the fate of the property of Joseph of Arimathea or of Nicodemus is unknown to us. These men rid themselves of their property and let the Seven Deacons carry its proceeds to the poor of the seven regions of Jerusalem, when the need arose, because that was what Christ had said; and "great grace was upon them all, because there was no one who went in need among them."¹

In later times it might be necessary for St. Paul to instruct the Church of Macedonia that, if a man did no work, neither should he be fed at the expense of the Church; and for the Didache to lay it down that

¹ Acts, 4, 33.

one who came in the name of the Lord should receive hospitality for two or three days only ; but this sharing spirit, quite apart from the observance of Poverty by religious under vow, has never died out of the Church, though many changes have come upon it with the centuries. It is still the badge or profession of Christians that they have love one for another ; that they keep riches at arm's length—and there are still some few of them whose greatest reward in almsgiving is to be undiscovered.

J. H. CREHAN

SHORT NOTICES

The intellectual leaders of the Catholic revival after the Napoleonic wars—Scheeben, Newman, Balmes, Taparelli and Brownson—had to undergo an eclipse when the period of their immediate influence on society was over. It is only now that they are coming into their own, and it is therefore opportune that the Jesuit Fathers of the review *Pensamiento* have produced a commemorative volume on the centenary of the death of Balmes who, at the age of 37, died in 1848 (*Balmes*, Madrid, Ediciones Fax). His fame is steadily increasing in Spain, where a 34 volume edition of his works has recently been completed by his biographer, Fr. I. Casanovas, S.J. The present work contains thirteen articles on various aspects of this many-sided genius. *Balmes, filosofo*, by Bp. F. Garcia, and *Importancia de Balmes como filosofo*, by Prof. Riera, put him in the setting of his times. These are followed by other essays on particular subjects such as his doctrine of 'sentido comun'. Among these an essay on *Balmes y Unamuno*, by Fr. Iturrioz, will be of interest to English readers who are familiar with the paradoxes of Unamuno. Finally, two articles by Fr. Flori, one on *El sentido comun* and the other a bibliographical work, are the last writings of one who had devoted a lifetime to the study of Balmes and who died as this volume was being issued. It was said of some of the saints that if the Scriptures were lost, they could have reproduced them from memory ; it may be said of Balmes that when scholastic philosophy was indeed lost, he was able to recreate it for himself and for others and that the revival which came later in the century was in great part built upon his labours.

From the University of the Sacred Heart at Milan comes a large-scale discussion of a small and little-known work of Cicero's, the *Topica*. (*Studi sul 'Topica' di Cicerone*, by Benedetto Riposati. Edizioni dell' Univeristà Cattolica del S. Cuore. Serie Pubblicazioni : Volume XXII. Milano, Società Editrice 'Vita e Pensiero', 1947. Pp. xv, 338.) The treatment is elaborate and scholarly, the author's main interest being the technical vocabulary of the treatise ; it is unquestionably a work for the scholar and the University library. Detailed criticism of the work is not possible here, but we can salute the indefatigable scholarship which has gone to its making. There is a bibliography, an index of ancient authorities, and another of Greek and Latin words.

PARTNERSHIP IN INDUSTRY

WE are continually being told by people of all political parties that increased production is necessary if we are to maintain our standard of living, and also that increased production can only be achieved if the present industrial bitterness is replaced by a "spirit of partnership." We were told this at Blackpool last autumn, at Bournemouth in the spring, and later at Margate; but unfortunately nobody seems to know how a spirit of partnership can be achieved. Profit sharing schemes are not very much use because Trade Unionists are inclined to suspect them as being primarily intended to increase the dividends of the stockholders. They are apt to regard payments made under such schemes as "hush money" paid to keep them quiet, and to demand their rewards irrespective of whether a profit has been made or not.

Now during the discussions on the Radio, last June, about ways and means of increasing production, two industrialists, Mr. Wilfred Brown and Sir Charles Bartlett, put forward the view that the only way of inducing the workers to co-operate wholeheartedly with management in increasing production was to pay a reasonable, instead of an unlimited, return on capital, and to distribute the surplus revenues of industry (either in cash or in kind) among all those actively associated in production. The workers would then know that extra effort on their part would mean better living sooner for themselves, rather than for the stockholders, and would know that hard work was the best if not the only way of increasing their own incomes. The profit motive would become operative for the whole working population. As in a peasant economy, the surplus of production would go to labour; the industry and devotion of the peasant proprietor would be reproduced in the factories.

Now to many it may seem a very good thing that the workers should be associated in this way in the enterprise for which they work; but two questions at once arise: first, if they are to share in profits why shouldn't they share in losses also? and second, why should anyone invest his savings in industry if he is only going to get a limited return?

The answer to the first question is, of course, that the reward of the investor is the reward for risk, and that if, as in the scheme we propose, his risk, his liability, is to be limited it is only right that his return should be limited too. It may be said that 2 or 3 per cent. received by an investor from Government securities is a "reward for abstinence," but any higher return can only be justified as a reward for risk, and when the investor's liability is limited his return should be limited. As we shall see later it is quite possible to arrange for workers to participate in risks *as workers* (not as petty investors) and to share in losses as well as profits.

The answer to the second question is that plenty of people to-day invest in preference shares without feeling that they are being unjustly treated. A large part of the investment by individuals that goes on in this country to-day is in Building Societies, in which the return is always limited. It is also limited in the case of securities issued by the Government and by many semi-public corporations, in preference share capital in industry generally, and of course throughout the co-operative movement. Most individual investors prefer a safe investment and a limited return.

The limitation of the return on capital does not mean that it should be reduced to five per cent or thereabouts. In the case of existing capital it means merely that ordinary shares should be converted into preference shares¹ of the same nominal value as the ordinary shares carrying maximum dividends equivalent to those previously paid on the ordinary shares if those dividends averaged more than 5 or 6 per cent. ; or perhaps of a higher nominal value, more or less equivalent to the market value of the ordinary shares, and carrying dividends of about 5 or 6 per cent. The dividend of the investor would not be *reduced*, but simply *limited* to the average, or perhaps even the maximum, dividend paid on the ordinary share. The preference shares would normally be redeemable cumulative preference shares,² but would, of course, carry no voting power so long as dividends were maintained.

Full dividends would be paid on all preference shares before any dividends were distributed as dividends on wages and salaries ; but preference shares already issued would carry priority over those issued in place of the ordinary shares. The preference shares forming the original capital of a new company would carry higher dividends than preference shares with higher priority issued subsequently. Persons establishing a new enterprise might, perhaps, be allowed a return of 15 or 20 per cent on the first hundred pounds or so of capital and they would, of course, receive an unlimited return in the form of dividends on wages or salaries.

In established industries the return on original capital after the first hundred pounds or so might be limited to 7 or 8 per cent. In more risky enterprises a return of 10 or 15 per cent might be more appropriate, and in such industries as football pools the return permitted on initial capital might be as low as 2 or 3 per cent. The main point is that dividends should be limited according to risks involved : not that the return on capital should be low, but that it should be limited.

There are, moreover, ways in which the risks of production can be so reduced that, in many industries, the return on capital need not be

¹ The dividend on preference shares is usually limited, whatever be the Company's profits, but is paid before the general dividend for the other shareholders is determined.

² Cumulative preference shares carry a right to the payment, as soon as the Company is in a position to pay, of dividends previously held back because of an unsatisfactory state of the Company's profit and loss account.

higher than is usual on preference shares to-day. In the first place the elimination of the ordinary share, of the so-called "equity," would make it necessary to empower companies to issue withdrawable "Proficiency Shares" carrying voting power but no dividends; this in order to give managerial personnel tangible evidence of their authority. Those responsible for launching any enterprise would be required to hold a certain number of these "Proficiency Shares," and a considerable number would also have to be held as a qualification for directorships and top managerial positions, though a few would also be issued to workers so that they would become members of the companies for which they worked by virtue of their employment.

No capital would be paid on Proficiency Shares, which might normally be of a nominal value of 1s. each, except in the event of a winding-up; in which case those who had been responsible for the direction of the affairs of the company would have to contribute a limited amount of capital from their own personal resources. This managerial liability would tend to reduce superfluous directorships, and would also make it easier for new enterprises to raise capital through co-operative industrial organizations.

In the second place risks can be reduced by the investor being insured against loss of his capital, in much the same way as workers can be insured against loss of their job. Quite a number of big firms accumulate a Dividend Equalisation Fund for this very purpose. It is a common practice for trustees to insure the assets of an estate and thus protect both themselves and the beneficiaries against risk of loss of both capital and income. The insurance of investors against risks of loss of their capital might appropriately be undertaken by Trade Associations or similar organizations, if they had adequate resources; but might just as well be undertaken by ordinary insurance companies. The Trade Association or Insurance Company could, for instance, take up preference shares on which no capital was paid up except in the event of a winding-up,¹ but which nevertheless carried dividends: such dividends would be equivalent to an insurance premium. In the event of a winding-up, capital would be paid up on such preference shares direct to the insured investors, who would, of course, have been receiving lower dividends than they would have received otherwise.

Again, companies could issue to their workers special "Risk Shares," carrying not only a limited dividend in the event of a profit, but also liability to contribute a limited amount of capital to the resources of the company in the event of a loss. No capital would be paid up on such "Risk Shares" except in the event of a winding-up, and they would be withdrawable at any time subject to two years' notice, or sooner by arrangement. In the event of the General Reserve of a company at the time of its ordinary general meeting being below what had been previously fixed as the necessary minimum working capital,

¹ Such preference shares are known as deferred liability shares.

workers and managers holding "Risk Shares" would be liable to contribute further capital up to, say, 10 per cent. of the nominal value of "Risk Shares" held by them. Such contributions would normally be made by predeductions from wages and salaries, so that the net result of bad times would be that some of those actively associated in the production would find themselves earning somewhat less.

Directors and managerial personnel would be required to hold a certain number of "Risk Shares" as a qualification for their office, but their holding would be limited. Workers would not be required to take up any, but would be allowed to take up as many as they liked according as they wished to participate in the risks of production. In most reasonably successful enterprises it is probable that the workers would choose to participate to some extent in risks rather than watch the managers take an excessively large part of the profits because of their assumption of additional liability; for, in the event of a profit, holders of "Risk Shares" would receive a positive dividend at least equal to that distributed directly as a dividend on wages and salaries.

Under such a system of distributing risks the workers would share in risks and in losses as workers, and not as petty investors. It would be certain earned incomes that would be the first to fluctuate with the fortunes of a firm; the primary risks of production would be borne by the management as such, and by such workers as chose to participate. If the residual risks of production were at the same time borne by Trade Associations or Insurance Companies, the risks of the investor would be very much reduced, and it would be possible to raise capital more cheaply. All capital would be raised by issuing redeemable preference shares rather than debentures,¹ since interest on the latter is paid whether a profit is made or not and they are therefore usurious. It is the redeemable preference share carrying a limited dividend, but only in the event of a profit being made, which represents the right relationship between labour and capital.

The proposed limitation of the return on capital would, of course, accelerate the present tendency for capital to be accumulated within industry: especially if income tax were imposed only on incomes distributed in wages and salaries and dividends, and not on the corporate incomes of companies. All corporate incomes of companies are ultimately distributed as personal incomes, so the State would not suffer; but the change in the incidence of taxation would do much to encourage capital accumulation within industry, and probably more than offset any decline in capital accumulation by individual investors. After all, most individual investors, as we have seen, prefer a limited return and would not be affected by a general limitation.

There is one case, however, in which investment by private individuals would probably increase: that is investment by the workers

¹ Debenture shares represent loans to the Company on the security of its assets; they have first priority in the payment of interest on them, which is always at a fixed rate.

in the companies for which they work. If their capital was protected by insurance the workers would tend to invest their savings in their own company because they would thus strengthen its financial position by enabling it to redeem outside capital, and because they would ultimately receive an unlimited return in the form of dividends on wages. All the workers in the enterprise would benefit from such investment by some of them : and so there would be strong social pressure on the other workers to invest their savings in this way, even to the extent of withdrawing savings from the P.O.S.B. or National Savings Certificates.

Companies would, therefore, tend to accumulate capital both out of their corporate incomes and from the invested savings of their workers, especially at times when they were not particularly anxious to undertake capital development. At the same time they would be anxious to strengthen their position by redeeming outside capital, which is a mortgage hanging over industry—the “ national debt ” of industry to the stockholders. To this end they would be empowered to purchase newly issued Government securities of the same market value as their own redeemable preference shares and exchange them for the latter. The result of this process would be that most industrial preference shares would tend to pass into the hands of the workers in the industries concerned, while outside investors not actively associated in production would, to a greater and greater extent, find themselves holding Government securities. As a reward for national saving the workers would tend to find themselves owners of, or at least chief stockholders in, the productive resources of their country.

It may be that in spite of capital accumulation within industry and by the workers, the total would not be sufficient for the requirements of industry generally. Some industries might perhaps accumulate more than they needed, but others would probably accumulate less. To provide the additional capital the State should try to accumulate it out of revenue rather than risk further inflation by issuing new money. The State should be prepared, through the Banks or appropriate corporations, to supply capital at different rates to different industries. Luxury industries, for instance, might have to pay 7 or 8 per cent, while essential industries like agriculture and housing, urgently in need of new capital, would not have to pay more than 2 or 3 per cent. New enterprises would be enabled to raise a large part of their capital through Trade Associations or co-operative industrial organizations, as well as directly from the State.

New enterprises, in new industries or in the development of new inventions, might sometimes find difficulty in raising capital through such channels ; in that case they would raise it privately. Investors in such enterprises might get 10 or 15 per cent or more, but they would not be allowed an unlimited return. If they wanted an unlimited return it would have to be arranged for them to be paid a salary for

more or less nominal work, and they could then get their unlimited return in the form of a dividend on salary.

The practicability of limiting the return on capital is demonstrated by the growth of the co-operative movement, and by the success in all kinds of enterprises of Mr. Valder's system of Employee-Partnership in New Zealand. It would hardly be practicable to limit the return on capital in some industries but not in others, for the latter would tend to get more than their share ; if the return is to be limited at all it must be limited throughout industry.

It is as practicable to incorporate this principle in company law as it is to apply the principle of limited liability, or any of the other provisions of the Companies Act. The variety and complexity of industry does not prevent the Factories Acts being applied throughout industry, any more than the variety of human beings prevents the Common Law being applied equally to all citizens. One final advantage of limiting the return on capital, and of distributing industrial surpluses to labour, lies in this : that it would make it possible to keep up demand, and full employment, without inflation.

PAUL DERRICK

SHORT NOTICE

In *Two Ways of Life* (Burns Oates. 1947. Pp. 111. 7s. 6d.) Dr. F. Sherwood Taylor submits "the two principal philosophies of the present day", Christianity and materialism, to the test of experiment. As he explains in his preface : "An examination of the effect upon the life of Man of the adoption of one or other philosophy by individual, family, or State, should reveal their respective worths." His materialists are not only the strict philosophical materialists, but those who (without, as a rule, any close philosophical analysis) esteem as real only that which is directly or indirectly tangible or sensible. He outlines the developed version of materialism and opposes to it a scheme of the Christian philosophy in a roughly parallel manner. After examining the inherent difficulties of the two systems, he devotes the rest of his book (about two-thirds of the whole) to an examination of their fruit in the inner life, in personal relationships, and in the social sphere. From the contrast thus drawn he concludes that there is an unanswerable case for investigation of the Christian philosophy. The author's plan and method, as a venture in "apologetics", deserve high praise. He writes in terms that the materialistically-minded, God-neglecting man of to-day can readily understand, and instead of merely proving that he is wrong and we are right, tries to make him see something of the riches offered to him by Christianity. The author's plan involves a limitation in the amount of Christian teaching expounded, and we think he might have given more hints of the full picture. We think, too, that the picture as he draws it is open to some objections. There is a strong tendency towards a "Christianity of the desert". His ideal Christian seems to be on the pessimistic side of the "Catholic centre" where human goods and activities are concerned.

ST. TERESA'S DRUM

DRUMS, considering their spirit-stirring power, are not much regarded in either life or literature. Possibly the drum of the human ear is responsible for this attitude of suspicion and disfavour. Gone are the good old days when a toy drum hung in every nursery, the little innocent thing having been crushed in a tremendous world-wide revolt of the fathers of families. There is always, of course, Drake's Drum, but the fortunes of that famous instrument were made by a man of vigorous rhymes (Capten, art tha sleepin' there below?) and a succession of powerful tenors rather than by Queen Elizabeth's and my favourite pirate himself. One may doubt whether Drake owned a drum at all, even if they do show it with pride at Plymouth. It is a soldier's instrument much more than a sailor's, though modern battle-fields know it not and drummer-boys are as extinct as little chimney-climbers. But whether or not Drake possessed a drum, St. Teresa certainly did, and that not a mere childhood's toy but a sizable affair, worthy of an army band. It is regrettable that this particular relic of probably the greatest woman in history, except the Mother of God, is so little known and esteemed, for it has a deep symbolic meaning. None of the Saint's eminent biographers breathes a word about her drum, no doubt because they considered it too frivolous a piece of furniture for the Interior Castle. And that is where they were utterly and absolutely wrong.

There is no accounting for tastes, and among all the myriad marvels of Spain the one thing I had a real craving to see was Teresa's Drum. But the Drum is in Avila and Avila is a weary long way from Madrid, at least in a Spanish train. Spanish trains are *sui generis*, not because Spaniards are poor engineers (they are among the best engineers in the world), but because their country was never created for trains. Even the lordly international expresses which ply between Madrid and Paris have almost to burst their boilers climbing 1,500 feet in the first sixty miles (Shap is only 1,000 feet), whereupon they must negotiate three mountain passes higher than the summit of Snowdon. So a little charity of judgment about Spanish railways is plainly in reason. Plainly also the best way to go to Avila is by road, for thus can two birds be killed with one stone as El Escorial lies more or less on the route, tremendous moving Escorial, where lie buried not only an emperor and kings and queens, but a dazzling epoch of human history, the Golden Age of Spain. In the Escorial Museum may be seen a small piece of natural lodestone which grips and holds half a hundred-weight of metal, but the lodestones we have come to see are far more wonderful, for they have gripped and held and will always hold millions of human hearts. They are the original holograph manuscripts of *Vida* and *Fundaciones*. On the subject of Teresa's handwriting

an eminent French graphologist has expressed the following judgment : *Il nous révèle une richesse et une plénitude vitales inconnues aujourd'hui. Il est merveilleux de trouver là une sensibilité aussi profonde et aussi ardente et, en même temps, aussi peu anarchique.* There was a man born blind who, when asked what he considered the colour purple must be like, replied that it probably resembled the blast of a trumpet. In the same fashion St. Teresa's splendid calligraphy might be said to resemble the roll of a thousand drums, rallying drums, drums of fierce battle and glorious victory.

The Spaniards have a rhyming apophthegm, usually astringent, to describe almost everything in their national experience. Thus, the weather of the Madrid and Avila world they declare to be "*nueve meses de invierno y tres meses de infierno*"—nine months of winter and three of hell, and Avila itself is "*Avila de los santos y cantos,*" of the saints and boulders, when it is not "*Avila de los caballeros,*" the Avila of chivalry. It is perched on an escarpment of the wild Sierra de Guadarrama three thousand feet above sea-level, and the boulders around, no mere outcrop but huge independent masses of rock such as demi-gods might have used as missiles, are as plentiful as waste paper on Hampstead Heath after a Bank Holiday. As for the town itself, it is the most betowered place in the whole world. Carcassonne, the pride and show-piece of France, boasts fifty towers, but Avila has eighty-eight, connected all the way round by walls forty feet high and fourteen feet thick. Even to-day, with anything but heavy artillery Avila would prove a hard nut to crack open. All this panoply of defence was not constructed so much to hamper the designs of Moors or other aliens, as to control the high spirits of Spain's own mediaeval children, who, if they had nobody else to fight, kept their hand in by attacking the next convenient town. That the women of Avila were as stout-hearted as the men became clear on a famous occasion of the *Reconquistad* when their husbands and sons had ridden away to war and the Moors made a sudden assault on the undefended city. Never did the infidel receive such a dose of boiling oil and tar as during that memorable siege, and never more heartily did he invoke all the curses of his Koran on woman-kind.

That Teresa was an authentic child of this embattled town is exceedingly plain in her writings and doings. "Kill us you may," she cried, "but conquer us, Never!" and again, referring to the rôle of contemplatives as standard-bearers : "Though the Ensign fight not in the Battle yet he is not therefore exempt from being in great hazard, and must needs in his interior suffer more than all the rest ; because, carrying the Colours, he cannot defend himself, and must not let them go out of his hands, though they cut him to pieces. So Contemplatives are to carry erect the Banner of Humility, and bear all the blows they get, returning none, because their duty is to suffer like Christ, to carry the Cross on high nor let it out of their hands for whatsoever dangers "

(*The Way of Perfection*, xviii, 5. Old English translation). In the finest sense of the words, to live dangerously was as meat and drink to the soldierly heart of Teresa. She would have her nuns to be "varones fuertes," strong men, so valiant that men themselves would stand amazed at them.

There is an eminence outside Avila from which a general view of the city may be obtained, but it is much better fun to climb the tower of the grand old cathedral and make that one's look-out. Never was there a house of God so obviously built to withstand the assaults of men. It may be doubted whether even an atom bomb would make much impression on these tremendous walls. The climb has to be done in the dark, for only now and then is there a narrow opening to permit of a shot at the enemy. Emerging two hundred feet up, the visitor is rewarded with a sight that takes away any breath still left to him: all the towers and palaces of this fantastic place at a single view. He has storks up there for company and innumerable bats and such a wind as would blow him back to Madrid did he not cling for dear life to a handy piece of fortification. Byron said that conversing with American visitors gave him a feeling "as if talking with Posterity on the other side of the Styx." Looking at Avila works the other way round and lands a man bang in the heart of the Middle Ages. There, even the ordinary people of the town have a withdrawn way with them, as though they had strayed out of another epoch and were still under the spell of their marvellous *Conciudadana*. And they are under her spell, as a visit to any of the churches or chapels of the city will speedily show. There cannot be a more devout community under the sun than those good quiet people who smile so readily and speak so seldom. A family of them lived at the top of the Cathedral with the storks and seemed perfectly contented.

Before going in search of St. Teresa's Drum, I had an urge, for the sake of the contrast, to visit another monument, the tomb of Torquemada, which all the guide-books declared to be in the grand old Gothic church of Santo Tomás. But the charming Dominican Father who answered the bell said: "Alas, he is no longer here, for during the first of our famous revolutions they came and dug up his poor bones and burnt them. Poetic justice they called it. Muy-triste, no?" and his eyes twinkled mischievously. Then for the Drum, to which a dignified cicerone, aged about seven, volunteered to guide the stranger. He was a philosopher, this baby, and, like most Spanish children, had very decided views about time and existence. Existence was serious but time utterly contemptible, a thing obviously made to waste by every possible means in one's power. Did he know of a town called Madrid? Yes, his father said it was away there over the mountains. Or of Sevilla? No, he had never heard of such a place, an ignorance that delighted his questioner who had just come from that most self-centred city on the face of the earth. Where was San José?

He did not know and neither did the elders of whom we inquired until some one suggested that we meant "Las Damas," whereupon a dozen volunteers fell in behind the important infant to show the way to St. Teresa's First Foundation. It is one of the undying charms of Spain, this gratuitous courtesy to strangers. The Ladies had locked up for the night, but without the slightest demur undid all the bolts and bars protecting their treasures, so that the tardy stranger might not be disappointed. Then out on a *torno* came the various relics, the manuscript copy of Osuna's *Third Spiritual Alphabet* annotated by Teresa herself, her little drinking cup, two flageolets on which she used occasionally to tootle a tune, the crucifix carried in the serio-comic little procession which she organized against the onset of creepy-crawly things, bearing the inscription chosen by her: "At the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth." Finally there appeared the Drum of all drums, which to tap seemed, to one lunatic anyhow, almost like hearing the beating of Teresa's Heart.

No doubt this is mere subjectivism and wise men will know how to deal with it, but might not Teresa's Drum be thought to stand for the rights, however restricted, of gaiety and even frivolity in religion? Anyhow, Teresa's great modern son, Père Bruno de Jésus-Marie, has recently edited a magnificent volume of the exciting and ever-stimulating *Etudes Carmelitaines*, bearing the title: *Ma joie terrestre où donc es-tu?* The tragic sense of life is all very well and only too solidly based, but Père Bruno and his brilliant team, one of whom is a young priest dying of a dread disease,¹ prove conclusively that joy has even stronger, indeed everlasting, foundations. A little study of the great Alexander Cruden, himself a man who no more than Teresa could ever be downed by outrageous fortune, shows that the words *glad*, *gladness*, *joy*, *rejoicing*, occur in the Scriptures no less than 414 times, whereas their black-stoled opposites, *sorrow*, *weeping*, *mourning* can only muster 265 entries, a score of nearly two to one for cheerfulness. Teresa would have appreciated the well-known and beloved Mr. Edwards who aspired to be a philosopher, only that cheerfulness would keep breaking in. Cheerfulness was always breaking in on her own illimitable troubles.

An entire book has been written on the theme of *La joie chez S. Thérèse*, and her nuns have borne eloquent testimony to the animation, the verve, the gaiety which she brought to their recreations. And the Drum is an effective witness that for all her sublime prayer she would willingly have endorsed such a maxim as *Christianum est desipere in loco*. St. Philip Neri, her junior contemporary and the inspirer of so many larks, went so far as to say that grace, in order to bear its full fruit, requires for substratum a natural gaiety of spirit. If it is not the wildest heresy to suggest it, Newman who loved Philip so tenderly

¹ His theme is the daring one of "Le Rire et la Croix."

never quite caught his spirit, being too much obsessed with the Augustinian pessimism, and the same applies on other grounds to the exuberant Faber. As for the Mediaevals, numbers of them, including Thomas à Kempis and the author of the *Dies Irae*, were unconsciously led astray from the true Christian tradition which listed sadness among the deadly sins by the resurgent Manichaeism of their age. But there were St. Francis of Assisi and St. Thomas Aquinas to keep the good flag flying in poetry and prose. Deeply considered, there never was such a radical optimist as the staid and measured Angelic Doctor.

Fas est ab hoste doceri, and Nietzsche in *Zarathustra* made a telling point when he wrote that if Christians would convert him to belief in their Saviour, then they must wear an air of having been saved. That is precisely what the first Christians did, not even hesitating to paint their Lord as Apollo with his flute. Poor and persecuted though they were, they gave the impression, wrote Clement of Alexandria in the second century, of remaining perpetually young. The Liturgy of Christmas is full of the word 'new,' and St. Irenaeus, an inveterate optimist, replied to the Rabbis who objected that many of Our Lord's teachings were as old as the hills: "He brought all newness in bringing Himself." Even Augustine, whose moon has its dark side, shone often with a lovely light, as when he said: "Let us not so grow as to become old after being new, but let newness itself grow." God did not become man to teach us to be stoics but as little children, and gaiety is of the essence of childhood. Our human nature is good and glorious, nor are we told anywhere in Scripture that we must swallow a poker in order to be pleasing to our Father in Heaven. That is the significance of St. Teresa's Drum.

JAMES BRODRICK

EDITORIAL NOTE

All contributions submitted to the Editor must be typed and be accompanied by a sufficiently large stamped addressed envelope—stamps (or Post Office coupons from abroad) alone will not suffice. Articles so submitted should be concerned with matters of general interest, and be the fruit of expert knowledge or original research. They should not ordinarily exceed 3,000 words, and must be intended for exclusive publication in "The Month," if accepted.

Literary Communications, Exchanges, and Books for Review should be addressed to The Editor of "The Month," 114 Mount Street, London, W.1, and not to the Publishers: Business Communications to The Manager, Manresa Press, Roehampton, London, S.W.15.

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

BRING NORWAY BACK

THERE are many surprises for those who serve in the Royal Navy. Some are pleasant, others are not . . . especially in wartime. But I have in mind one very happy and pleasant surprise. Once I found myself Chaplain to all the Allied Navies : the Free French, the Belgian, Dutch, Yugoslav, and even the Greek. I am not really a polyglot, but I often found myself giving my Sunday sermon in three different languages !

But my best and biggest surprise was when the Royal Norwegian Navy, officers and men, came to Holy Mass. Then I began to feel sorry I had not been among the Apostles on the First Whit Sunday. Normally we had but one lonely Norwegian rating at Mass, but from this time on the whole section came. For a while I thought it was either curiosity or a mistake. It was no mistake, for they came so regularly that we had to reserve places for them. Moreover the parson had often pointed out to them their error. Nor was it mere curiosity ; they were so reverent at Mass that I was glad of their example for the sake of the Catholic Allies. Their determination to come was quite fixed, and it seems to have led them to defy their Supreme Chaplain who wished to oblige them to attend a Church Service corresponding to the Lutheran forms. Those Norwegian sailors were proud to see their ensign in a Catholic sanctuary : St. Olav and St. Magnus were back where they belong.

I must confess that I preferred the Norwegians to the other Allies. They are a strong upstanding and clean race. I reckon their love of the sea gives them their fine healthy features and body. They have all the manly virtues of heart and soul. The Norwegians love the sea and ships. From the time of the Vikings to the present they have been first-class navigators and sea warriors.

That, no doubt, is why they are so sympathetic to us of these islands. Long years ago our Norse relations, as we know, tried hard to settle permanently in England ; those who served in the Home Fleet during the war will be aware that the Orkneys are very Norwegian islands.

In this short article I wish to check the belief of those who maintain that Norway is definitely Lutheran. True that, according to Article 8 of the Norwegian Constitution, "the Evangelical religion shall be the religion of the State and of the King". Nevertheless I can quote to the contrary these words of a young Norwegian sailor : "Come to our country and help to bring our people back to the fold . . . they are not really Protestant." Those words of that young sailor sounded to me like a command. But unfortunately, I come a long way after St. Olav—and the need of passports and of permissions from Religious Superiors make it difficult for me to run off to Norway just now, dearly though I would like to. For firstly I love the Norwegians, and secondly I believe firmly in their basic Catholicity.

The famous writings of Sigrid Undset, and the classic Sagas of Norway, are delightful reading, and they make one wish there might be made a greater Catholic effort for that country.

The Faith was first brought to Norway in the year 955, when John XII was Pope. The Norwegians were forced out of the fold when Norway lost her independence in 1537. When Norway was reduced to be a vassal-state of Denmark by the power of the anti-Catholic King Christian III, her people became subjected to Martin Luther and the other Reformers. But this vineyard of the Catholic Religion had flourished for six hundred years before that. The Sagas give us a clear picture of Norwegian life and customs in early Christian days. The fastings, pilgrimages and penitential exercises of the Norwegians in Catholic times almost suggest a religious community. Pilgrimages to the tomb of their patron, Saint Olav at Trondhjem were as famous as those to the shrine of St. Thomas as described by Chaucer in the *Canterbury Tales*. When persecution came devotion to the See of Peter enabled the Norwegians to face great sufferings. In the struggle for the Faith many noble lives were lost. Their homes and churches were pillaged and sacked by the Protestant conquerors from Denmark. But their great cross was their loss of identity as a nation.

Norway's history has always been full of adventure and progress. If shipbuilding means anything to civilisation we owe a great deal to the Vikings. Let us remember too that when the Norse raiders settled in any country as immigrants they taught that country, England like the rest of Europe, the value of discipline without loss of self-respect, also the value of order and organisation. Propaganda-history styles them sea-wolves and pirates, but our own Drake and Raleigh did not always sail the seas according to Admiralty Instructions. The Norse sea wolves belong to the times of paganism. In the pagan days religion in Norway was tribal; it was part of the warlike tradition of each tribe. Religion was different indeed when Norway became Catholic.

Now England did much for Norway in the past to bring about this happy change. May that historical fact be a pointer also for the future. During the war the sons of Norway have captured our hearts and admiration. We should realise how much may be lost through a failure to keep in closer touch with our Scandinavian friends. Indifference may form a barrier harder to penetrate than an Iron Curtain.

It was so early as 950 that King Haakon sent to England for missionaries. He wished the Faith to come to his people from Rome indeed, but through England. And this same was the desire of the young Norwegian sailor whose words I have quoted. While paganism still held the whole of Norway in its grip the courageous King Haakon introduced a Catholic bishop and a number of priests from England. Later it was an English Cardinal, Adrian Brakespear (afterwards Pope Adrian IV) who made Trondhjem the Metropolitan See of Norway because the national shrine of St. Olav was there.

Later still Christianity in Norway was reinforced from Germany. The Metropolitan See of Hamburg became the centre of the Norwegian Church. Unfortunately the authority of the medieval German Emperors was not always wielded for the good of the Church. The bishops sometimes followed that lead and made politics rather than religion their motive. In the same way Teutonic policy nearly destroyed the good work of Saints Cyril and Methodius among the Slavs. Had not Pope John VIII granted, despite Teutonic opposition, the request of these apostles, when they strove to preserve the language and customs of their converts, the Slavonic Church would have been still-born. So also the close association with the Teuton at the time of the Reformation made the invasion of Lutheranism into

a once flourishing Catholic community much easier than it would else have been.

Before making any practical suggestion towards brighter hopes for Catholicism in Norway one must acknowledge with gratitude the great work already done by secular priests and by the religious orders: such as the almost superhuman achievements of the present heroic Bishop of Oslo and his scattered clergy. One is mindful, too, of the magnificent work of the Dominican Order for the conversion of Norway. But I still cling to those words of wisdom "from the mouths of babes and sucklings". The words of that Norwegian sailor haunt me still. Why *can't* they have their missionaries from England? One bows of course before the experience and wisdom of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. So much has still to be done for the conversion of Asia and Africa. More missionary zeal must be found to meet the Moslem in the Near and Far East. Yet for all this one would like to see, and to help in, a work to recover such a grand people as the Norwegians to the unity of the Holy See. Norway to-day has a free and independent atmosphere more open to religious persuasion than before. She became once more a distinct nation in 1814. And though she declared at that time in favour of the Lutheran religion, the attitude of her people has, since then, become more tolerant and benign. The writings of that remarkable convert, Sigrid Undset, have done much good among intellectuals, and have provided an antidote to the "after-Christian" ideas of Ibsen and Herberg.

There is a fair field of tolerance in Norway now, and that is why we hope and pray for a greater effort "from Rome through England" for this grand people, that the desires of a king and a sailor, may be satisfied, and Norway be brought back to the fold.

And one further thought. In the past Russia has been influenced for good by the Norsemen. Might not Norway some day be a road through the "Iron Curtain", to be trodden by some future apostle worthy to be named with the noble names of the Kings of Norway: Olaf the Saint, Haakon the Good, Harold the Strong, Olaf the Quiet, Sigurd the Crusader?

WULSTAN DOBBINS, O.F.M. CAP.

A CHRISTMAS ECHO

THE Second Mass for Christmas Day provides two puzzles—slight enough in the former case provided we allow for a side-slip in the syntax: the latter seems to me to involve an unconscious dislocation in the thought.

The Collect says: "Grant . . . that *we* who are flooded with the new light of Thy Word made Flesh, *that* may glow forth in our work which through faith is shining in our mind". He means, e.g.: "Grant that we who are flooded (with the new light) may cause that which is shining in our mind to glow forth in our work": or, "Grant that since we are flooded, etc., that which is shining in our mind may glow forth also in our work". But this little slip prepares us for the possibility of the author's having made others later on.

The Post-Communion. "Huius nos, Domine, sacramenti semper novitas natalis instauret cuius Nativitas singularis humanam repulit vetustatem." I translate literally: "O Lord, may the natal newness of this sacrament ever build us up, whose unique Nativity has thrust back human oldness, Through the same. . ."

To clear the ground—*Instaurare* is not really the same as *restaurare* which can safely be translated 'restore'. *Instaurare* looks rather towards a more perfect future than to a past deficiency to be made up, though in e.g. a hymn in the old Paris Breviary, the two words might seem to be identified—"De pristino lapsos statu—Non solus instauras : simul—Nostros labores exigis", which echoes the old "Qui te creavit sine te—Non te salvabit sine te": but here the first 'operative' word is *solus* : and anyhow our salvation is not only 'from', but 'to'. Compare perhaps the un-translatable word *vegetare* : a wilting plant is to have new sap infused into it to make it *grow* and not merely to stand erect. Probably we should not here refer to our *instauratio* into Christ (Eph. i 10) which translates *anakephalaiosis*, the bringing of all things as to a head in Christ, though conceivably the word might have been 'ringing a bell' under the author's consciousness.

Seeing that the Collect is composed wholly of 'balanced' expressions, we may assume that *semper* 'balances' *singularis*—the constant renewal of sacramental life, and Christ's 'unique', never-to-be-paralleled, Nativity. *Repulit humanam vetustatem* seems to me doubly strange : but 'human oldness', the abstract where we would have put a concrete, e.g. 'the old Adam : the old self', or at least 'that which in human nature had grown old', is doubtless due to *novitas natalis*, 'birthday newness' already used ; but to 'repel' this 'oldness' as if it were something exterior attacking us is unexpected : we might have foreseen *expulit*—'has driven out' something grown musty and effete, if not positively poisonous in our soul : compare *expurgate vetus fermentum* : 'purge out the old leaven' : 1 Cor., v ; used in the Epistle for Easter Sunday.

But what we now come to surely is puzzling—the 'balanced' phrases : *huius sacramenti novitas natalis . . . cuius Nativitas singularis . . .* To speak of the natal newness of a Sacrament is doubtless odd : but the sense is clear—the new birth, or at least renewal of life, typified and imparted by the Blessed Sacrament. But since only by violence can one separate *huius* from *cuius*—'of this Sacrament . . . of which . . . '—'which' refers to what 'this' does, i.e. to Sacrament, and we find ourselves speaking of the Nativity of a Sacrament. If we could make 'of this' and 'of which' refer to different things, we might translate, either : "May the natal newness of the Sacrament of *Him* (not but what you would expect *illius*) upbuild us, whose unique Nativity, etc.". Or, straining the words still further, and making *cuius* refer to the *Lord* : "Lord, may the natal newness of this Sacrament upbuild us, O Thou of whom the unique Nativity, etc.". Yet this could not possibly be right, because of the 'per cundem' ; the Lord *must* be God the Father. If, then, in the former prayer there was a side-slip in the syntax, here there would be a certain dislocation of thought.

The author, then, since 'light' and 'newness' are key-words in these Christmas Masses, concentrating here on the latter, may have proposed to write a prayer somewhat on these lines—"May the new gift of this Christmas-Sacrament constantly increase our life, for the Nativity (celebrated to-day) has once and for all routed that which in humanity had grown old." To pack all that into the lapidary Latin of the Missal would tax any man's skill. Lietzmann, *Sacr. Greg.*, xxxi, indicates a MS confusion. Read : "*Hujus . . . sacramenti semper natalis instauret, cujus [sc. sacramenti] novitas etc.*"

C. C. MARTINDALE.

II. OUR CONTEMPORARIES

We are glad to print here, especially for the benefit of our Polish guests in Great Britain, a notice communicated through a priest in Louvain of the monthly review of the Jesuit Fathers in Poland which has now renewed publication: To anyone interested in the current of Polish thought the reappearance of *Przeglądu Powszechny* will be welcome. The review, it may be remembered, was founded in 1883 by Fr. Morawski, the well-known author of "Soirées au lac de Genève". It has had a succession of remarkable editors: Fr. Pawelski; Fr. Urban, the promoter of the movement for the union of the Eastern Church; Fr. Kosibowicz, shot by the Nazis after the Warsaw rising in 1944. The eighty pages of the first number of the revived review maintain its fine, fully Catholic and truly Polish, tradition. "The charisms of the Polish Nation," by Fr. Wawryn will give encouragement to those who may be questioning the strength of the Polish spirit. Professor Konopczynski writes "The Judgment of History" on the events of the last few years. There is an article by Fr. A. Kisiel on "The problem of theism and atheism from the point of view of mathematical logic", and one by Madame Winowska on "The Gospel of the Holy Spirit". There are the usual "actualities": for example, some notes on relations of the Pope with President Truman, an account of changing conditions in Poland, and the usual competent reviewing of recent literary work. The publishing address is: Redakcja "Przeglądu Powszechnego", Warszawa XII, ul. Rakowiecka 61, Poland.

Making a kind acknowledgment of our notice of the monthly *La Vie Spirituelle* in December Père Henri, O.P., writes to say that this journal of the spiritual life can now be obtained through the Editor of *Blackfriars* at Oxford. It hopes to build up again its former considerable circulation outside France before the war. The current number (February) contains a valuable article on "The apostolate and holiness of life".

The veteran *Irish Monthly*, still associated in the minds of veterans with the name of 'Father Matt. Russell', has been changing its outward appearance of late and in a measure also the style of its contents, which now aim at being in large part a commentary on current events. The number for January, 1948, is of a slightly different shape, with an attractively set-out cover and considerably more pages, though the price is still 1s. The first article shows that Ireland too has been having trouble over a Health Services Act. It seems that voluntary effort in the matter of hospitals is threatened, and even that in the writer's opinion "the Department of Health proposes to abolish professional secrecy". The Health Act is called an "enabling" one, and the article is apprehensive as to the manner in which its authors will use "the great powers it confers on the Department". An article on the outlook in France in the same number, by Jean Dutertre, dated November 20th, 1947, deals very interestingly with the French political mind of the moment, its dread of extremes, its readiness to consider all systems, even Communism, on their merits, and its distrust, at present, of theorists. A thoughtful paper on memory and modern psychology, one on "Clinics for Problem Children" (by a nun), and another on "Recent Art Exhibitions," by Daniel Shields, show the wide range of this Journal. Only three pages are given to reviews and one hopes that this feature will be strengthened to provide a Catholic guide to Irish and other literature.

The December number of *Studies*, a quarterly that might almost be known as the *Dublin* 'Dublin Review' has besides several articles of an especially Irish concern three or four others of yet more general interest. One of these is Charlotte M. Kelly's vividly written account of the historical vicissitudes of the Church in Mauritius: it is of absorbing interest, and is also 'edifying' in the best sense of that word. Catholic Mauritius owes a great deal to Irish missionary zeal and also to that French heroic virtue which translates faith so uncompromisingly into action: one does not wonder that the 'cause' of Père Jacques Laval has been introduced at Rome. This "Apostle of the Blacks" is well named here "a second Peter Claver". John Leonard's article on Madame de Maintenon and her school at Saint Cyr for daughters of the nobility makes fascinating and at times amusing reading. Fr. Arthur Little essays the task of making the early history of abstract thought among the first Greek philosophers intelligible, and even exciting, to "the man in the street", and with no small measure of success: Parmenides becomes something like the hero of a mystery thriller! This is the first of a series of papers on the same theme. Christopher Hollis contributes a critique of Nicholas Berdyaev's "The Russian Idea" and suggests that "the Marxian economics are a comparatively minor aspect of the present Russian picture". The Russian soul has both an "apocalyptic" and a "Messianic" cast: "The Russians are an intensely unhistorical people. They have no Roman tradition. Russia is, as Sprengler truly said, 'an apocalyptic revolt against antiquity'." This revolt becomes a revolt against God. In Dostoevsky's words "the Russian atheist does not so much reject God as indict Him". And the Russians have always been "Messianic" in the sense of deeming that they are destined to deliver the world from the thralldom, once of antiquity, now of religion. "The only hopeful line of policy is to wean the Russians from their Messianic complex by treating them as other men. . . ."

The winter *Downside Review* continues vigorously its policy to be mainly a review of theology and metaphysics, and opens with some passages from a translation of the "De la Connaissance de Dieu" of Père H. de Lubac, S.J., which is to be published shortly by Sheed & Ward. In a foreword Fr. de Lubac is spoken of as "a theologian whose influence will prove (we believe) to be of great moment", and one who is contributing to a movement of theological thought which reconciles the 'speculative' with the 'positive'. In this vein Dom Sebastian Moore contributes an article on "The Blessed Trinity: a Plea for Biblical Theology" in which he seeks to study the mystery of the Trinity "in the Church", that is in the relations of the Church, and of Christian souls, to the three Persons: "God has told us that He is Three, that He is a family; but he has only done so by making us members of this family. If, then, we are not thinking as members . . . we cannot attach a real meaning to the statement that God is Three." Dom Hugh Connelly criticises destructively recent attempts to prove from 'Aramaisms' in the language of the gospels the existence formerly of Aramaic versions. He goes into interesting detail over many examples in the writings of Dr. Matthew Black, C. C. Torrey, and H. F. D. Sparks. Fr. Vincent Turner, S.J., proposes a novel and revolutionary setting of the events that are recorded in the Gospels as preceding and following the birth of Christ in Bethlehem, and so gives the incident of "no room at the inn" an entirely new aspect.

REVIEWS

"IF DEMOCRACY BECOMES CHRISTIAN"¹

DEMOCRACY is rapidly assuming the status, if not the form, of an Established Church in the modern secular State: in the name of a new religion a violent and cruel war is being waged, all over the world, but especially in Central Europe where the partisans of Catholicism and Protestantism fought a similar battle three centuries ago. Europe, still the cockpit of the world, occupies more than half the space in Don Luigi Sturzo's latest book which—having in mind an American public—he has written in order "to contribute to a better knowledge of the past and a sound preparation for the future".

He has succeeded so well in the first aim that he cannot fail entirely of success in the second. The whole subject of nationalism and internationalism is so vast that it cannot be treated within the compass of three hundred pages without tremendous omissions. Don Sturzo has nothing to say of the nationalisms of Asia, now pressing so hard on the attention of Europe; and nothing of that limited kind of nationalism which existed in Europe at the time of the Reformation. He is concerned entirely with that modern nationalism which is at once popular and political: the volcanic movement of which the French Revolution was the first eruption. As it has developed since then, particularly in France, Germany, and Italy, it has become not merely politically predominant but nationally disastrous. When Don Sturzo treats of this development, and of the simultaneous development of liberalism and of the labour movement (whether Socialist or Christian-democratic) he is lucid, logical and balanced.

In spite of certain criticisms which the book calls for it must be considered valuable. What it contains is of far more importance than what it leaves out. The fields of war and empire—until recently the only meeting-places of the nations—are the subjects of two chapters which lead to a discussion of internationalism itself. It is not a reflection on the general quality of this part of the work to say that a passage in the chapter on "Modern Wars" could be cited to illustrate the disadvantages of the "logical approach": to show how it drives a writer into sharp definitions, and sweeping assertions of general principles, until the reasonableness of the approach is vitiated by the rashness of the conclusion. Thus, of wars between different civilizations, Don Sturzo writes: "The struggle transcends the character of a common ethics, and on its outcome are dependent the moral and social existence of the warring factions. Under this aspect such wars can be called religious in character, in so far as every civilization has its own specific character and religious content—as the most penetrating sociology realizes. . . . The modern wars that represent a clash of civilizations (though within the same community of civilized people) were those of the period of democratic and liberal revolutions, and, in our own times, the two World Wars. It is true that these have not a religious character, and do not base themselves upon a religious idea; the States are secular and the wars are presented under a secular aspect. But religious sentiment in such wars is not lacking; and so they are wars of civilization."

¹ *Nationalism and Internationalism*. By Don Luigi Sturzo, Dennis Dubson, 308 pp. 15s.

Now all this depends upon what you mean by civilization. Many people will prefer to Don Sturzo's notion on this point the following dictum of Mgr. Ronald Knox: "But if you asked yourself what you mean by a civilized as opposed to a barbarous country, the answer sticks out a mile. The answer is that a civilized country is one in which you can travel without a revolver in your pocket."

Don Sturzo is a great believer in the dialectic of history: by which he seems to mean its inevitable character. "Since in the dialectic of sociology (not that of Hegel or Marx, but real and human dialectic) to-day's affirmation originates from yesterday's negation—while producing in its turn to-morrow's negation—and from different viewpoints the negation and the affirmation are convertible: it becomes necessary, whenever something new is affirmed at a given historical moment, to seek out its characteristics, in order to define the negation it contains." And he writes of contemporary empires: "Having arrived at maturity, the two rivals face one another for a decisive war, or are compelled to the periodical wear and tear of periodical wars, until one yields and the other emerges; or else the two wear themselves out, thus creating the favourable conditions for another empire to rise, or, if it has already risen, to reaffirm itself and prevail."

Don Sturzo, however, qualifies this view of the dialectic of history as follows: "This law, like all historical laws, is not fatal [absolute?]; it can be corrected by the will of men. . . . But not every correction brought to the thrust of events succeeds in modifying very much that historical conditioning which, by its importance and complexity, overpasses the normal limits of human sagacity and wisdom."

It is clearly, then, the duty of a judge of events to exercise his discretion in the application of such mutable laws. And so one may ask whether it is discreet to write of events at Rome in 1870 like this: "If that breach [of the Porta Pia] was an offence against the double right of the Pope, religious and spiritual, it was also the mark of an historical maturity which it would have been impossible to arrest. The temporal power of the Papal State had had, for more than a thousand years, an historical task of extraordinary range: now, like every passing reality, it too was being transformed into another reality, more adapted to the times." Such appeals to historical necessity, however much or however little importance may be attached to particular examples, are dangerous. They are dangerous if only because they are powerful weapons in other hands. How easy it would have been, in 1922, for the Fascists to talk of "another reality more adapted to the times", when—in Don Sturzo's own words—"the Liberals, instead of forming a solid front with the Populists and Socialists, attempted to come to an understanding with the Fascists in the municipal elections of 1920 and 1921, as well as in the political election of 1921, and in the successive phases of the struggle." At that time the author attempted several times to obtain a common front among Social Democrats, Socialists and Populists, and the formation of a government in which the Socialists would participate. But after various discussions the Socialist leaders preferred to stay out. In the end they gave support to the general strike of July-August, 1922. The Italian bourgeoisie was alarmed and decided for Fascism. The March on Rome took place in October, 1922. The King refused to sign the decree for a state of siege and for the use of arms to suppress the Fascist insurrection. The *coup de main* succeeded. Mussolini became head of the Government and dictator.

Many years of exile have not weakened Don Sturzo's unshakable faith in Christian Democracy. His example should help to maintain that faith in others. But there is an acute question which remains unanswered. Is the Christian Democratic movement all that is now required in the political order? If there is a normal level of honesty and intelligence, can the Christian Democrats succeed in the secular State? It is no doubt as true as it was when Leo XIII said it, that "If democracy becomes Christian, it will bring great good to the world". But it is another question whether that condition can be fulfilled in the present order. As we read the story of Christian Democracy during the past half-century—illustrated chiefly by reference to Italy—it is to present-day France, above all, that the lessons seem to apply. Already the "Christian" Party, the MRP, occupies the diminishing central position between extremes where more than one Christian Democratic Party has been strangled to death, with terrible consequences for the world.

In the Preface to his book Don Sturzo speaks of it as containing "a dominant thought throughout, the influence of morality on politics, and the duty of subordinating politics to morality." Nevertheless the question we have posed seems to be more insistent than ever after one has read his book: and this because of his consistent refusal to face the issue of the relation between Church and State. Don Sturzo has given us his views on that subject before, but the recent history of nationalism and internationalism has thrown upon it a new light. Readers of the MONTH are familiar with the thesis (its great exponent is Christopher Dawson) that modern society has about it something that is fundamentally irreligious and anti-democratic. If the dialectic of history means anything at all, there must at some time be a reaction from the wholesale secularization of public life. The implications of this in the international field do not need expansion here; but they will be all the more conspicuous to those who read the lucid exposition by Don Sturzo of the gloomy pass to which internationalism has already come.

FRANK BURGESS

GREEK PHILOSOPHY AND CHRISTIANITY¹

WHETHER or not there is or can be a Christian philosophy is a disputed point. Some people would maintain that there can no more be a Christian philosophy than there can be a Christian biology or Christian mathematics. There can be a true philosophy, as there can be a true biology; but there cannot be a Christian philosophy. If it is true, it will be compatible with Christian teaching; but it will not be specifically Christian, as Christianity is a revealed religion, not a philosophy. Others would maintain that there can be a Christian philosophy, even that philosophy *must* be Christian in order to be adequate. But in any case it is obviously possible to write a history of ancient philosophy in function of the philosophy of Christians, i.e. to emphasise and set in relief those aspects and problems of Greek philosophy which influenced the thought of Christian philosophers (or of philosophers who were Christians), and to indicate the salient points on which the Christian thinkers were at variance with the non-Christian thinkers who influenced

¹ *An Introduction to Ancient Philosophy*. By A. H. Armstrong. London: Methuen. 1917. Pp. xvi, 241. Price, 15s. net.

them. It is from this point of view that Mr. Armstrong has written his introduction to ancient philosophy, a book which grew out of a series of lectures delivered at the headquarters of the Newman Association in London. The present reviewer had better say at once that he regards Mr. Armstrong's book as a valuable addition to Catholic literature on the history of philosophy. The author is to be congratulated on his work, and the Newman Association on securing his services as a lecturer, and on arranging with Messrs. Methuen for the publication of what is, in one respect, an unusual book.

About half the book is devoted to the study of post-Aristotelian philosophy, and the author gives much more attention to the philosophical movement which led up to Neo-platonism than one generally expects to find in a work of this sort. There is a careful and sympathetic study of the system of Plotinus, greatest of the Neo-platonists, the man whose writings exercised an important influence on St. Augustine. In addition, there is a sketch of early Christian thought. Even when the author of a general work on ancient philosophy considers Plotinus worthy of detailed consideration, he practically always omits any treatment of the early Christian thinkers. There is certainly a good deal to be said for considering Patristic thought as an introduction to the treatment of medieval philosophy; but there is also a good deal to be said for Mr. Armstrong's procedure, both from the viewpoint of chronology and from that of philosophical influence. An understanding of the philosophic themes in Patristic thought requires a knowledge of Greek philosophy, particularly of the Platonic and Neo-platonic philosophies, but also of the Aristotelian and Stoic systems. By including early Christian thought Mr. Armstrong is able to fulfil his intention of showing what Christian philosophy owed to the Greeks and how it differed from pagan philosophy. I was a little disappointed to find no mention of St. Gregory of Nyssa, on whom several studies have appeared in recent years and who is, to my mind, a very interesting figure; but Mr. Armstrong could very reasonably plead considerations of space. One might also have desired a more extensive treatment of St. Augustine's doctrine of illumination; but, as the author says, St. Augustine does not speak clearly on the matter. With what the author does say on this subject the reviewer is in substantial agreement. In any case the inclusion of early Christian thought enhances the value of the book to the Catholic student.

Mr. Armstrong's sympathies are evidently with Plato and Plotinus rather than with Aristotle; but he does not allow himself to be prejudiced by his sympathies, and the account of Aristotle's philosophy is excellent. The Catholic reader would do well to study it carefully, as it is not possible to have a proper appreciation of St. Thomas' work and thought unless one realises what the historic Aristotle actually taught. As to Plato, Mr. Armstrong will not be surprised if the present reviewer demurs somewhat at his rather summary dismissal of the "Neo-platonic" interpretation of Plato. Mr. Armstrong has on his side the big battalions, it is true, and he may be right in his view (the question is far too complicated to permit of a dogmatic answer); but he sometimes shows a little hesitation as to the complete validity of his own position. Thus having said that "there is no justification" for attributing to Plato the later Platonists' ideas on the One and the Good, he admits that "the strange and solemn language of the passage in the *Republic* (508 e) suggests that the explanation I have given is not really adequate", while he acknowledges that he has

"occasional serious doubts" as to the validity of his contention that Plato never identified the Good with the "Supreme Mind which rules and orders the world". I am certainly not prepared to state that the author's contention is wrong: I simply wish to point out that he himself does not always feel that certainty in regard to its truth which some of his assertions would imply.

A second point concerning Plato. Whatever I may have said myself in print, I now seriously doubt whether Plato ever came to hold that the nature of each Form can be expressed by a number. Professor Cherniss' investigations have convinced me that a very good case can be made out for the view that Plato, while admitting, for example, oneness and twoness among the Forms, never identified each Form with a number. I now think it possible to interpret Aristotle's polemic in such a way that it is not necessary to suppose that Plato, in later life, surrendered to Pythagoreanism and mathematicised the Forms.

The author is not, it seems to me, quite fair in his account of the philosophy of Philo the Jew. According to Mr. Armstrong, the result of Philo's use of allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures is that "the literal meaning disappears completely in his exegesis". I do not think that this is quite accurate. Philo condemned the extreme allegorists and meant to adopt a moderate position, retaining both spirit and letter or "soul and body". One cannot, of course, deny that he rejects the literal acceptance of some of the statements of Genesis, for example, and that he is not infrequently inconsistent, leaving the reader in a state of doubt as to whether he accepts or rejects the literal as distinct from the allegorical interpretation; but his general theoretical position is one of moderation, demanding an acceptance of both senses of the text. He certainly allegorizes whatever he considers to be contrary to reason or to attribute to God something unworthy of Him or incompatible with His nature; but the principle involved in this practice is not peculiar to Philo. In any case it is an overstatement to say that the literal meaning disappears completely, except perhaps in certain instances.

In an otherwise very well printed volume there are one or two misprints, of no great consequence. Thus at the end of l. 10 on p. 39 a full stop is omitted, while in l. 14 of p. 126 there is a redundant full stop. But these are no more than very minor printer's errors in a useful and lucid volume, which is to be recommended to the Catholic student. F. C. C.

THE EXISTENCE OF GOD¹

DOM MARK PONTIFEX'S book on the existence of God is a praiseworthy achievement, and it can certainly be recommended for the use of study-circles. It is evidently the fruit of much careful and patient thought. Nevertheless, it is doubtful if the aim of being "comprehensible to the general reader" has always been achieved: indeed, I think that the notice on the book's jacket is in this respect rather misleading. There is certainly a need for simple and clear books, comprehensible to the general reader and explaining "the living system of Thomism"; but unless the reader of Father Pontifex's book enjoys

¹ *The Existence of God. A Thomist Essay.* By Dom Mark Pontifex, Monk of Downside. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1947. Pp. xv, 181. Price, 7s. 6d.

a previous philosophical training, he will need some competent guidance and help if he is to get the best out of the book. That is why I said that it can be recommended for study-circles.

The title of the book might lead one to suppose that it deals exclusively with the existence of God ; but in point of fact it covers a considerably wider field, thereby enhancing its value for the purpose above mentioned. It includes, for example, chapters on free will, universals, knowledge, certainty, and on ethical principles. But the statements are often very succinct, and for the "general reader" elucidation will probably be indispensable. "If we understand properly what is meant by God, the absolute, unconditional, self-existent Being, then included in this idea is that of One whose will obliges us in an absolute and unconditional way. But why do some people who reject the existence of God accept moral obligation? Perhaps we can answer that this is due to a confusion, that such people do in fact accept an almighty power by accepting moral obligation, even though in words they deny the existence of God" (p. 156).

I think that this is true ; but it needs to be explained how the above statement does not involve (as it does not necessarily involve) the view that the moral law rests simply on the divine will. An uninstructed reader might understand it as implying sheer authoritarianism in ethics. Again, "the authority of the State derives its force only from the claim that obedience to it is the best means for the individual to realize his nature. There is only one end in human affairs which is of moral obligation, and that is the realization of man's nature" (p. 161). A good many readers would not understand the meaning of this statement, while some might take it to imply a Spencerian view of the State. But the statement might well form the basis for a discussion in a study-circle, provided that some competent philosopher was present, in order to direct the discussion and supply the right explanation.

When I had read the author's explanation of analogy of proportionality, on pp. 19-20, and found that he apparently interpreted it as meaning similarity of dependence on God, I rejoiced, believing that he had discarded analogy of proportionality in the sense in which the phrase is sometimes used. "X is to its being as Y is to its being" is interpreted as being equivalent to "X is to God as Y is to God". But on p. 34 I found the author saying that analogy of proportionality means that "God is to His being as the creature is to its being". "The first cause is to its being and so to God as the effect is to its being and so to God". Thomists may count this a helpful doctrine of analogy ; but that does not make it true, and to my mind it is metaphysically valueless, and false into the bargain.

There is a rather strange discussion of the principle of individualism on p. 92. "Matter and quantity, together, matter signed by quantity, to use the scholastic phrase, make up the principle which causes individuality. Matter signed by quantity acts as a kind of differentia which determines or narrows down the specific form and so produces the individual form". Now, what would the "general reader" make of a statement like that? The Thomist doctrine of *materia signata quantitate* is difficult enough to understand in any case (some of us would consider it practically unintelligible) ; but the author gives no explanation of the technical meaning of "signed with quantity" : his words would imply that matter and the accident of quantity are the principle of individualism, which is quite impossible on Thomist premisses, since the actual accident of quantity must be logically posterior to information of matter by the specific form.

The author raises a very important difficulty in regard to our knowledge of God. "Is there any meaning left to our concept of perfection when all limitation has been removed, when we have entirely emptied it of all that characterizes the creature?" (p. 29). The author argues that we have experience of limits and that "if limit has meaning, beyond limit must have meaning also. The negative is never conceivable except in relation to the positive. But beyond limit is the unlimited or infinite. . . ." Yes, but in order to justify the "affirmative way" against the attacks of the logical positivists, something more is required. We can know that the Transcendent exists, that which is implied by the limitation of every creature; but when we predicate positive attributes of God, what meaning attaches to the terms used? If all our knowledge is founded on experience and if we have no direct experience of God, what is the positive content of concepts predicated of God in the affirmative way? Scotism, with its doctrine of univocal concepts, would offer an answer, right or wrong; but how is Thomism going to justify the affirmative way in such a manner that it would be really distinguishable from the negative way? I do not mean to imply that Thomism cannot perform this justification; but I should very much like to see it done adequately, and if Dom Mark Pontifex has time and inclination to turn his hand to a criticism of logical positivism, and a thorough justification of Thomist natural theology, in face of the attacks of the logical positivists (which are by no means negligible), he will earn the undying gratitude of Thomist philosophers. F. C. C.

THE FALL AND THE UNIVERSE¹

A NUMBER of engaging considerations arise when the question is raised of the effects of original sin on creation—apart from human kind. Were the animals in any way lowered when original sin invaded the world? Would there have been a 'nature red in tooth and claw' had there been no original sin? Are earthquakes, raging volcanoes, tornadoes, with all the rest of the menaces of material nature, to be attributed to some aboriginal dislocation of the once wholly beneficent handiwork of God? And if so, does the Redemption of man in any way extend itself to the rest of creation? Is man's use of creatures and things material, as helps to his own salvation and that of others, the only way in which nature—other than man—has a part in the Maker's plan for the world?

The sub-title of M. Frank-Duquesne's fascinating work is "Dans quelle mesure l'univers physique a-t-il part à la Chute, à la Redemption, et à la Gloire finale?" That the question so raised, and the answer supplied are worthy of careful study are things testified to by M. Paul Claudel in his six page preface. There is something of kinship between the great poet-dramatist and our author. All the poetry and high symbolism of Claudel has its counterpart in the theological prose of Frank-Duquesne. Nor will it be matter for surprise that so original a book has three prefaces. The second briefer preface, by the Benedictine abbot of Mont-César notes that the author brings his evidence for the solidarity of nature and man, leading to the envelopment of the former in the final glory of mankind redeemed. A twelve-page third preface is supplied by R. P. Deboutte, a Redemptorist professor of theology in Louvain; he describes himself

¹ *Cosmos et Gloire*. By Albert Frank-Duquesne. Vrin: Paris. 1947. Pp. xlv, 201.

as 'un thomiste de stricte observance'. In very sympathetic terms he outlines his own reactions to the unfamiliar thought of M. Frank-Duquesne, which he characterizes as oriental and akin to that of the Greek Fathers; over against the author's findings he sets a series of quotations from St. Thomas, one of which answers the last question of the first paragraph of this review.

The six chapters of "Cosmos et Gloire" contain a remarkable wealth of texts, liturgical references and quotations. Among the latter is an unexpected but relevant passage from Mr. Herbert Agar's "A Time for Greatness" dealing with the hypnotic influence of publicity which governs all modern business life. But in the main it is texts from the scriptures, and extracts from the liturgy, which bulk large in the book. Russians like Boulgakov and Soloviev, sympathetic French scholars like Père Congar, O.P., and Père Daniélou, S.J., rub shoulders with the liturgist Brightman and the hymnologist Mason. Even Edgar Allan Poe and Baudelaire make a passing appearance, while the late Père Descoqs' discussion of evolution is referred to in a note which includes MM. G. Salet and L. Lafont.

Perhaps chapter five will give some idea of the book, with a not unfair indication of its scope. The title of the chapter is 'Ce qu'en dit l'Esprit-Saint'. At the outset St. Paul is discovered as finding in himself the suffering and the woes of all of nature (which position, observes the author, the Buddha had nearly come upon); and in the human participation in the Divine nature by grace, which is the essential mystery preached by Paul, the whole of the lower creation comes to its redemption. More fully developed, this conclusion is detailed in the exegesis of the seventh chapter of the epistle to the Romans; a pathetic personal point is made by the author who mentions in passing how much this doctrine meant in light and strength for him during his Nazi camp experience at Breendonck in 1941. The rest of chapter five contains an exegesis of Psalm 148, and of the Canticle of the three young men in the fiery furnace recorded in the Book of Daniel. The exegesis is not the scientific treatment of the text, seeking its literal meaning; the approach is not that of a Prat, a Calès, or a Linder; but the poetical, symbolic and mystical satisfy the author. If they do not wholly satisfy the reader they will at least stimulate him, for the book is, for all the unfamiliarity of its outlook, essentially a deep and a live one.

R. C. G.

SHORT NOTICE

Neil Kevin says many things that ought to be said, and says them well, in his book with the quaintly borrowed title, **No Applause in Church** (published in Dublin by Clonmore & Reynolds, Kildare Street, price 6s.). Each of his twenty-three short chapters is full of thoughtful suggestion. "On being a Sport," "On being a Snob," "On being too Cheerful" and "On Religion and Good Manners" are specimen chapter headings which show the rich nature of the contents. The author is, of course, looking at things as a layman, from the benches or pews of the church, and does not pretend to the viewpoint of the presbytery or the pulpit. But his irony is always just, his wit usually kindly, and his attacks honestly made. Most readers will appreciate a pleasing 'balance' in this book, and the absence of any attempt to drive truths home by the method of lively overstatement.

The Way of the Moon

(Thanksgiving for Lourdes visited September 1925)

NOT alone for the weak,
Nor upward only, the way
Hangs iced-jutty and all to seek :
But the fall-track, I say,
Even to the bold baffling can be and blind ;
Test out the last stratagem of love it may
Before one high-crest dweller wind
Down to the sunless canyons, sandalled with fire of the peak.

Moon-stratagem. See
This pool of the young stream,
With girl-grace overhung of the birch-tree,
Cross-latticed with dusk and gleam ;
Glass clear where the nenuphars at the dark edge
Dream all day not knowing of what they dream ;
Shuttered close in its girdle of sedge,
And wide to the high skies only, only to skyward free.

At fall of the night,
Over this upturned face,
Hunter of shadows and herald of light,
A wind came crying Give place !
And down the whole steep of the heavens descended the moon,
And doubled that depth again, and stood in her grace
In the meek deep of the little lagoon :
A crescented still fire that is softest of all things bright.

From the wood side
A troupe of the spotted deer,
Timid for all their antlered pride,
The silvered brink draw near :
And see, in a lucent cave of the brimmed round,
A wonder that riding high in the heavenly clear
Their groundlong looks had scarcely found ;
And cool-cleanse miry hooves in a plash of the tranced tide.

For this mirror true
Of the pure burn, a debt,
Your love, poor hairy fools, is due :
Which you shall not forget
Whenas, dropt low for your low-ranging eyes,
In the grey dawn or in the flushed eve set,
The lovely stainless crescent lies,
And in her intense light one near-neighbouring star shines through.

GILES F. Y. FORBES.

"THE UNIVERSE"

The Leading Catholic Newspaper
merits your support.

It has faithfully and zealously served the Catholic Cause at home and abroad during the whole period of its long history 1860-1947. Its able editorials, Notes and Comments, powerful articles and unrivalled news service place it in the front rank of newspapers.

EVERY FRIDAY 2d.

Direct Subscriptions: 13s. Inland, or Abroad per year. Inclusive of postage.

Special terms for members of His Majesty's Forces: 10s. per year, inclusive of postage, and *pro rata* for 6 or 3 months.

Head Office:

Field House, Breams Buildings, London, E.C.4.

Prices net, postage extra

PRACTICE OF PERFECTION AND CHRISTIAN VIRTUES

By Father Alphonsus Rodriguez, S.J. Translated from the Original Spanish by Father Joseph Rickaby, S.J.

Crown 8vo. Authorized English Edition complete in two volumes, 30s. per set; 16s. 6d. per single volume. Volume I.—Treatises i-xi, with portrait of author, pp. xviii + 878. Volume II.—Treatises xii-xxiv. With portrait of translator, pp. xvi + 688.

MANRESA PRESS, ROEHAMPTON, S.W.

MANUAL OF PRAYERS FOR YOUTH

(SIXTIETH THOUSAND)

With the approbation of the Archbishop of Westminster and of the Archbishop-Bishop of Southwark.

This excellent prayer book, an especial favourite in Catholic Colleges and Convent Schools, was entirely re-arranged by the late Father Joseph Keating, S.J., in consultation with various spiritual Authorities. The manual has been described as truly manly and practical, and appeals to all whose piety is sincere, simple and devout.

Price, 4/- net cloth boards.

LONDON:

MANRESA PRESS, ROEHAMPTON, S.W.15

SWORD OF THE SPIRIT

President:

HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL GRIFFIN
Archbishop of Westminster.

The **Sword of the Spirit** was established by Cardinal Hinsley in August, 1940

To unite Catholics in an understanding of the spiritual issues arising from the war;

To emphasize the need for Christian principles in social and international reconstruction;

To call upon Catholics for more sincere **Prayer**, for more serious **Study** of the Church's teaching on social and public questions, for more energetic **Action**.

The **Sword of the Spirit** Bulletin is published every month. Price 6d.

Headquarters;—

12 CITY ROAD, LONDON, E.C.1.

TRIBUTE

to a great work being done through members

"May I take this opportunity of sincerely thanking the C.T.S. for helping a born Catholic to realise the tremendous privilege which God has given him."

This one of many instances which could be quoted; one item from the vast collection of evidence to the value of a work which is calling for your support.

Write TODAY for details of membership.

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY

38-40 Eccleston Square, London, S.W.1

THE MONTH

EDITOR REV. JOHN MURRAY, S.J.

THE MONTH was founded in July, 1864, to represent the point of view and the claims of the Catholic Faith, and it has continued to do so for more than eighty-three years. The need to fight the battles of the Church in English-speaking lands—a cause to which the periodical is wholly consecrated—was never greater, and the Editor ventures to hope that the support given to his efforts may always continue and be extended.

PUBLISHERS Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co., Ltd., London.

Annual subscription 20s. post free (U.S.A. \$4.50) should be sent to the Manager, Manresa Press, Roehampton London, S.W.15.

THE CHRIST OF CATHOLICISM

A MEDITATIVE STUDY

By

Dom Aelred Graham

A Christological study of the first importance by a theological writer known on both sides of the Atlantic, in which a wholehearted acceptance of the dogmatic teaching of the "great Church" of Christendom, and the witness of the early Fathers does not preclude a sympathetic appreciation of such religious thinkers as Kierkegaard, Emil Brunner and William Temple.

2ls. net

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LTD.

THE WESTMINSTER VERSION OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES.
A New Translation from the Original Greek and Hebrew Texts. General Editors :
the Rev. Cuthbert Lattey, S.J., Professor of Fundamental Theology at
Heythrop College, Oxon, and the Rev. John Murray, S.J., Editor of *The Month*.

THE NEW TESTAMENT IN FOUR VOLUMES

VOLUME I—THE GOSPELS OF MATTHEW, MARK AND LUKE, by the Rt. Rev.
Mgr. Dean, D.D., Ph.D.

(CHRONOLOGY AND HARMONY OF THE LIFE OF CHRIST, by the Rev.
Cuthbert Lattey, S.J.) 8vo. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

VOLUME II—THE GOSPEL OF JOHN, by the Rev. W. S. Reilly, S.S., S.T.D. THE
ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, by the Rev. Cuthbert Lattey, S.J. 8vo. Cloth,
10s. 6d. net.

VOLUME III—THE EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS (1st and 2nd), GALATIANS,
ROMANS, EPHESIANS, COLOSSIANS, PHILEMON and PHILIPPIANS, by
the Most Rev. Alban Goodier, and Fathers Lattey, Keating, Keogh and Rickaby, S.J.
8vo. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

VOLUME IV—THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS, THE PASTORAL AND JOHAN-
NINE EPISTLES, THE APOCALYPSE, THE EPISTLES OF JAMES, PETER
AND JUDE, by the Rt. Rev. Mgr. Boylan, D.Litt., D.D., Francis Gigot, S.T.D.,
and W. H. Kent, O.S.C. 8vo. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.

LONGMANS, GREEN & Co., LTD., 6 & 7 Clifford Street, London, W.1